HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

VOLUME XXXVIII NUMBER 2

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

APRIL 1945

THE MYTH OF MÔT AND 'AL'EYAN BA'AL
Vivian and Isaac Rosensohn Jacobs 77

RELIGIOUS ENTHUSIASM AND SEPARATISM IN COLONIAL NEW ENGLAND
Maurice W. Armstrong 111

THE LAYMAN'S COMPLAINT AND THE FRIAR'S ANSWER . *Francis Lee Utley* 141

CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1945

Issued Quarterly $3.00 a Year Single Numbers $1.00

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Issued quarterly by the Faculty of Divinity in
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Editorial Committee

ARTHUR D. NOCK
WILLARD L. SPERRY — GEORGE LA PIANA
J. A. C. F. AUER — HENRY J. CADBURY
WILLIAM THOMSON

The *Harvard Theological Review* is maintained on the foundation established under the will of Mildred Everett, daughter of Charles Carroll Everett, Bussey Professor of Theology in Harvard University, 1869–1900, and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, 1878–1900.

The scope of the Review embraces theology, ethics, the history and philosophy of religion, and cognate subjects. It aims to publish investigations, discussions, and reviews which contribute to the enlargement of knowledge or the advance of thought.

Remittances and communications on business matters should be addressed to the *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.*

PUBLISHED BY THE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
PUBLISHERS OF THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Entered as second-class mail matter January 2, 1908, at the post-office at Boston, Mass. under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special postage rate provided for by Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 31, 1918.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XXXVIII APRIL, 1945 NUMBER 2

THE MYTH OF MÔT AND 'AL'EYAN BA'AL

VIVIAN AND ISAAC ROSENSOHN JACOBS
EAST ORANGE, NEW JERSEY

THE myth of Môt and 'Al'eyan Ba'al, who is Hadad, recounted in the texts unearthed at Ugarit,[1] is a work of the schematizing imagination, and expressive of the ordered relations of natural phenomena conceived as embodied in gods. The systematic organization of the events in which the gods are caught, or which they dominate, shows that the myth arose from "observation of the great annual fluctuations of the seasons and a desire to explain them," and that the authors or revisers, "brooding over the mystery of external nature," sought "to lift the veil and explore the hidden springs that set the vast machine in motion." [2] We are well aware that "the civilized nations of western Asia and Egypt pictured to themselves the changes of the seasons, and particularly the annual growth and decay of vegetation, as episodes in the life of gods, whose mournful death and happy resurrection they celebrated with dramatic rites." [3] But in our texts we are introduced to subtle variations. Here the lapse, absorption and return of the rain are interfused with the regeneration and decline of plants in a rhythmic process to which no parallel is to be found among extant documents of similar purport and provenance. And the investigation of "nature's plan," however cumbered with besotted notions, is so diligent as to bring the resulting depiction close to the twilight zone between mythology and the speculations of the early physical philosophers. Our myth does not picture nature as animated by a jostling crowd of capricious deities, confusedly making war upon each other. There is

[1] We refer particularly to II AB, I* AB and I AB.

[2] The quotations are from J. G. Frazer, Adonis, Attis and Osiris, London, 1919, Vol. II, p. 158.

[3] J. G. Frazer, Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, London, 1912, Vol. I, p. vi.

struggle, but it is subordinated to controlling principles, and the individual wills of the incensed gods, even when they are avowedly bent on shattering the established design of nature to remould it nearer to their desires, are not allowed to disrupt the ordered occurrence of events. Not only are the vicissitudes of the farmer's year, the growth and decay of vegetation, the alterations of the seasons, the changes of atmosphere by which the products of the earth are ripened and matured, portrayed as episodes in the life of gods, the varying fortunes of the gods themselves are conceived as episodes in an unbroken sequence of causation. We have in our texts one of the clearest and most ingenious expressions that have come down to us of the ideas assembled by Frazer in those portions of The Golden Bough which are less a generalized description of primitive man or a codex of magic than an intensive study, on the basis of primitive material, modern pagan survivals, and the comparison of typical recurrent motifs, of certain salient aspects of the mythology of civilized men who believed that natural phenomena "were not merely the result of their own magical rites, but that some deeper cause, some mightier power, was at work behind the shifting scenes of nature." [4] The artificers of our myth may still have felt that the manifestations of nature were in some way the concomitants of magical rites and cult-ceremonies, but when we discover that they were impressed by the aspect of inevitability which the processes of nature presented to them, we must conclude that even if they believed they were in part the makers of particular phenomena, they at the same time regarded themselves as discoverers and delineators of general laws. The devising of our myth, the "attunements of the whole" and the patient integration of the sprawling elements of nature, may tempt one to discern the presence of an allegorizing hand. But our myth is not an allegory, in which the images and depictions indicate, but are not permeated by, the meaning. Our myth is the reality of its day and cult.

The deities we shall encounter, as we explore the meaning of our myth, are 'El, the supreme deity of the Ugaritic pantheon; 'Athirat, his consort; Ba'al, the god of the fertilizing rain, who

[4] Adonis, Attis and Osiris, I, p. 3.

"opens the sluices of the clouds and gives forth his holy voice," [5] and who, as Zechariah has led us to expect, is a dying god; 'Anat, Ba'al's sister and wife; 'Athtar, who occupies Ba'al's throne when Ba'al is dead; Šapaš, the goddess of the sun; and Môt, whose nature must be properly understood before the myth can be made intelligible. The complete designation of the god is *Bn 'Elm Mt, Ydd 'El Xzr.* Though *Mt* in all likelihood is to be read "Môt" and taken as signifying "Death," the deity thus denominated is not exclusively an emaciating, attenuating, abating or curtailing force. An obliterating force he is not, of course, for death was not obliteration in the belief or speculation of the *milieu* with which we are concerned. He may exhaust and empty men of their substance, shutting up the meagre residue in his subterranean fastness, but from that deep realm he also brings them sustenance. He, too, is a generator of fertility. Ba'al may be the Water of Life, but Môt, though lord of the underworld, is the Bread of Life.

One is at a loss to understand the lingering opposition or unresolved doubt in some scholarly quarters on the subject of Môt's relation to the grain. Whatever else he may be, and whether or not he is the precursor of Adonis (as Adonis has heretofore been commonly explained), Môt is the god of the corn. He undergoes the fate which overtakes the crops and to which the grain-god is therefore universally subjected. In one of the few relatively certain passages in our texts, we are told that 'Anat seized Môt, clove him with a sword, winnowed and burned him, and ground him between mill-stones.[6] To suppose that a deity, conceived as typifying only barrenness, will be made to undergo the characteristic mode of destroying the standing grain, is baselessly to postulate a grave state of mental confusion on the part of the artificers of our myth concerning a simple matter well within their competence to apprehend. To assume that a god is subjected to the agrarian rite described in our texts for any reason other than the obvious one that he is the deity of the crops, is to make an assumption unwarranted by anything of equal certainty in those texts and unsupported

[5] II AB vii 27 f.
[6] I AB ii 30 ff.

by the findings of comparative mythology. From a Tammuz text [7] we learn, in confirmation of the antiquity of the depiction of the god's death accepted at Ḥarrân,[8] that Tammuz died when the roasted grain which had been cast upon him was ground between stones. Tammuz is the corn.[9] So is Osiris,[10] and we know from a dramatic text that Horus cried to the followers of Set, the animals treading the barley spread out on the threshing floor: "Do not strike this, my father!" [11]

Dussaud has rightly insisted upon due recognition of the vegetative nature of Môt,[12] but he has felt it necessary to reject the opinion that the god's name means "Death," and has refused to accept the clear import of the testimony of Philo of Byblos, who wrote: "Him the Phoenicians denominate Death and Pluton." [13] If a study of early religions and modern pagan survivals established that death-god and grain-god are incompatible forms, consistently disassociated in mythology, Dussaud's position would have much to commend it, and his contention that Philo's account was based on a misapprehension [14] would deserve more consideration than it has received. But there is no justification either in anticipatory theory or uncovered fact for adopting the premise that the idea of death as a subterranean force and that of buried, growing, and dying vegetation are unfusible, or for arriving at the conclusion that they are in practice habitually kept apart.

Philo, it is to be observed, explained Môt by Pluton, in addition to giving the Greek equivalent for death. Now, Môt, as we have noted, is not only Death, but also *Xzr*, that is, "Abundance" or "the Abundant (One)" (Arabic: *ḡ-z-r*), and as Plato

[7] E. Ebeling, Tod und Leben, Berlin and Leipzig, 1931, Vol. I, p. 47.

[8] D. Chwolson, Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus, St. Petersburg, 1856, Vol. II, p. 27

[9] E. Douglas Van Buren, "The Ear of Corn," Analecta Orientalia, Vol. XII, pp. 327–335.

[10] H. Gressmann, "Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris," Der Alte Orient, Vol. XXIII, p. 22.

[11] K. Sethe, Dramatische Texte zu altaegyptischen Mysterienspielen, Leipzig, 1928, p. 134.

[12] Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, Vol. CV, pp. 272–273.

[13] C. Clemen, "Die phoenikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos," Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-aegyptischen Gesellschaft, 1939, p. 30.

[14] Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, Vol. CXVI, pp. 122 f.

put it in the semi-serious discussion he placed in the mouth of Socrates, "Pluton gives wealth, and his name means the giver of wealth, which comes out of the earth beneath. . . . To us who are upon earth he sends from below exceeding blessings." [15] From Cicero we learn that "the entire bulk and substance of the earth was dedicated to father Dis (that is, Dives, 'the rich,' and so in Greek *Plouton*), because all things fall back into the earth and also arise from the earth. He is said to have married Proserpina . . . — they think that she represents the seed of corn." [16] In the Eleusinian cult, Pluton, the ruler of the dead, with the cornucopia as attribute, played a central rôle in the dramatic representation of the vicissitudes of the grain. We know that the god was variously depicted in all the stages of life from suckling babyhood to white-bearded age; these depictions, paralleling the succession of phases in the germinating, sprouting, flourishing and decline of plants, and thus illuminating his rôle in the Eleusinian mysteries, serve to connect him with the rising and falling vegetation gods.[17] This is the Pluton who, even denying the semantic relation of Ploutos-Plouton to *Xzr*, might well have been used by an expositor writing in Greek to explain Môt's nature and function to his readers.[18]

That all things go back to earth and rise out of the earth was a commonplace of antiquity. This oldest of themes had expression in the cult of the subterranean gods. Concerning chthonic deities it has been correctly said: "Dwelling beneath the soil they guarantee two things to their worshippers: they bless the cultivation of the ground and ensure the increase of the fruits of the soil to the living; they receive the souls of the dead into their underworld." [19] Hesiod advised the Boeotian husbandman to offer a prayer to Subterranean Zeus or Pluton

[15] Cratylus, 403.

[16] De Natura Deorum, II, xxvi, tr. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library, London and New York, 1933, pp. 187–189.

[17] M. P. Nilsson, "Die Eleusinischen Gottheiten," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, Vol. XXXII, pp. 100–101.

[18] To hold with W. F. Albright (BASOR 83, p. 41, n. 16) that if *Xzr* be connected with Arabic *ǧazîr*, "its use with respect to Môt would naturally be euphemistic," is to ride one's theories hard.

[19] E. Rohde, Psyche, London and New York, 1925, p. 159.

at the time of sowing.[20] Demeter was not alone the corn-mother; she was also the goddess of the dead, whom the Athenians described as "Demeter's people." [21] The corn-maiden, Kore, too, had a double character and manifested her power in both realms.[22] The dual aspect of the dead and the gods of death comes out clearly in the treatise on dreams written by or attributed to Hippocrates:

> To see the dead clean and in white cloaks is a good sign, and to receive something clean from them indicates both health of body and the healthiness of the things that enter it. For from the dead come nourishment, growth and seed. . . . But if, on the contrary, one should see them naked, or clothed in black, or not clean, or taking something, or bringing something out of the house, the sign is unfavorable, as it indicates disease.[23]

The same polarity of conception is to be found in the myths and hymns of the peoples of the Near East. The lord of the dead, Nergal, frightful "house," underworld force, yet clothed in fruitfulness, is explicitly described as bringing both death and life to man; in his beneficent aspect he causes the earth to yield its plants and multiplies their growth.[24] Upon Enmešarra, depicted as lord of the nether regions and possessor of such vast power that he bestowed sceptre and ring on Anu and Enlil, all earthly abundance depends; without him Ningirsu can neither effect the spread of fertilizing waters nor produce the grain.[25] The ghost of Enmešarra is made to cry: "Grind me, grind me!" [26] — an obvious association of the god

[20] "Works and Days," 465, The Homeric Hymns and Homerica, tr. H. G. Evelyn-White, Loeb Classical Library, London and New York, 1914, p. 37.

[21] L. R. Farnell, The Cults of the Greek States, Oxford, 1896–1909, Vol. III, pp. 48–65.

[22] Ibid., pp. 118–125.

[23] Regimen, IV, xcii, tr. W. H. S. Jones, Loeb Classical Library, London and New York, 1923, p. 443.

[24] E. Ebeling, op. cit., pp. 165, 166; C. F. Jean, "Déités de l'Hadès Babylonien," Revue des Études Sémitiques, 1936, p. xli; cf. M. Jastrow, Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens, Giessen, 1905–1912, Vol. I, p. 473; J. Böllenrücher, "Gebete und Hymnen an Nergal," Leipziger Semitische Studien, Vol. I, pp. 3, 8, 9.

[25] P. Jensen, Texte zur assyrisch-babylonischen Religion (Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, Vol. VI, pt. 2), Berlin, 1915, pp. 50–53; A. Jeremias, Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur, Leipzig, 1929, pp. 149, 380; S. H. Langdon, Semitic Mythology, Boston, 1931, p. 147.

[26] E. Ebeling, op. cit., p. 36, as revised by Ebeling, Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft, Vol. X, pt. 2, p. 25.

with the agrarian rite. Osiris is "lord of the netherworld," and at the same time "lord of provision, prince of green plants." [27] Tammuz, departing with the grain, goes to the throne of the subterranean realm; in death he is "lord of the underworld," which place is designated as his "spacious sanctuary" and "chief establishment." [28]

The question of the historical connections in cult or otherwise between these gods, and between them and Môt, need not be considered. What concerns us is the identity of the ideas they focus and embody. It is a matter of secondary importance whether Môt is the same as Adonis. The primary interest is to understand Môt for what he is. An examination of the gods related to him in essence serves this purpose. Even the (il) Mûtu of the Assyrian text dealing with the descent of a king to the underworld gives us no hints of barrenness and infecundity. (Il) Mûtu, who is expressly distinguished from the "Wicked God," is depicted as possessing a *mušḫuššu*-head, human hands, and perhaps serpent-limbs.[29] But these characteristics are more indicative of fertility than they are of evil.[30] In Sumerian mythology, the *mušḫuššu* is especially connected with Ningišzida, god of vegetation, form of Tammuz, son of the lord and lady of Arallu, a beneficent force and the beloved of the gods,[31] also "throne-bearer of the wide nether world." [32] The corn-goddess Nidaba has serpents springing from her shoulders,[33] and the vegetation-god in an Egyptian hymn is addressed as "lord of sleep, upon his bed, whose limbs (?) are serpents." [34] The "Death" — or where euphemism prevails, "the lord of sleep" and other bland-seeming titles — of antiquity is as much involved in the blossoming and fruition of

[27] R. O. Faulkner, "Bremner-Rhind Papyrus," Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, Vol. XXII, p. 127.

[28] P. M. Witzel, "Tammuz-Liturgien und Verwandtes," Analecta Orientalia, Vol. X, pp. 323, 355.

[29] E. Ebeling, op. cit., p. 5; cf. W. von Soden, Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, Vol. XLIII, pp. 1–31.

[30] S. H. Langdon, Tammuz and Ishtar, Oxford, 1914, pp. 114 f., 126 f.

[31] C. F. Jean, Le Milieu Biblique avant Jésus-Christ, Paris, 1936, Vol. III, p. 142.

[32] S. H. Langdon, Semitic Mythology, pp. 104, 283–285.

[33] Ibid., p. 78.

[34] S. Schott, Urkunden Mythologischen Inhalts, Leipzig, 1929, 1939, Vol. II, p. 188.

life as the dead ancestors in the Ešmunazar Inscription are bound up with their living descendants in the growth and expansion of families in the light of the sun.

Some investigators in the field of Ugaritic mythology seem to have been put off in their analyses less by Môt's position as lord of the underworld than by the bluntness and baldness of his designation — Death.[35] Imperfect recollection of Frazer's discussion of the European peasant ceremony of "Carrying out Death," which preludes the entrance of Summer, Spring or Life,[36] seems to have militated against an adequate comprehension of the nature and activities of Môt. He is Death, and Death, it is recalled, is something to be got rid of, and what you eject, in order to permit nurture and growth, cannot be aught but a "barren rascal." But there is more to Frazer's account than this, and, what is of greater significance, there is even more in Mannhardt's account [37] on which Frazer's is based. Since we have found that many scholarly readers of The Golden Bough have carried away a distinct impression of aversion from the figure of Death, and remember little of the positive virtue enshrined in it, we give more detail in our summary of the account than we should otherwise be inclined to. In the peasant customs dealt with, Death is the puppet which is thrown away, and Summer or Life, the branches or trees which are brought back. "But sometimes a new potency of life seems to be attributed to the image of Death itself, and by a kind of resurrection it becomes the instrument of the general revival." [38] "The being which has just been destroyed — the so-called Death — must be supposed to be endowed with a vivifying and quickening influence, which it can communicate to the vegetable and even the animal world." [39] In some parts

[35] Thus every scholar in the field, with the exception of J. A. Montgomery, misconceived and mistranslated a crucial passage in our myth (II AB viii 12 ff.; I* AB iii 15 f.) descriptive of the throne and the dominion of Môt. Having given the god a bad name, the scholars proceeded to hang him in their construction of that passage. It was publication of V AB which saved Môt from ignominy.

[36] The Dying God, London, 1911, pp. 233 ff.

[37] Wald- und Feldkulte, Berlin, 1904, Vol. I, pp. 155 f., 412 ff.

[38] The Dying God, p. 247.

[39] Ibid., p. 250.

of Lusatia, the puppet of straw representing Death, which is taken away and torn into pieces, and the tree which is brought back with rejoicing, wear the same shirt. In Transylvania and Moravia, the feminine finery covering the effigy of Death is transferred to the body of the living girl who leads the ceremonial return to the village of those who participated with her in the removal of Death.[40] The Nuremberg custom represents Death, as it does Summer, by the green branch of a beech tree upon which an apple is fastened for a head. As they carry the branch, girls in festive attire sing: "We carry Death into the water, carry him in and out again." [41] In Upper Lusatia, moreover, Death is clothed in the shirt of the last villager to die before the festival and in the bridal veil of the last girl to wed before the festival.[42]

The effigy called Death, then, is an embodiment of the spirit of vegetation, and the ceremonies in which it is the central figure "bear the stamp of a dateless antiquity." [43] The more specific spirit of the matured corn, commonly conceived as old, is also to be found associated with Death. At Schwarzwaldau "the Dead One" is the name given to the last sheaf, the seat of the corn spirit. Of this vegetation demon dwelling in the grain, children are warned to beware. In the region of Hradisch in Moravia children must not go into the corn, for there "Toothless Death" sits with his scythe. In Upper Hungary they say that Death sits in the corn and devours the children. When the grain is caught up into waves by the wind, it is because Death rides there on a horse, sprinkling with fire the child whose curiosity has led him there. The Saxon children in Transylvania play the game of "schampelnder Tod" at the time of the maize harvest. The child who enacts the rôle of Death is completely encased in maize leaves.[44]

Now, whatever further conclusions may be drawn from the foregoing practices — and we need not expect full recognition of the implication here among peasants since their agrarian

[40] Ibid., pp. 247–249.

[41] W. Mannhardt, Wald- und Feldkulte, I, pp. 412–419.

[42] Ibid., p. 413.

[43] J. G. Frazer, The Dying God, pp. 252, 253.

[44] Wald- und Feldkulte, I, pp. 419–420.

rites have come down to us in what Durkheim has described as a "disintegrated condition," severed from the original system of which it was a part [45] — it is certain that, as they stand, they constitute a striking confirmation of the interpretation of Môt adopted in this essay. An effort might be made to explain them away, but then the burden of proof would rest on the shoulders of him who seeks to avoid the surface implications of the customs. And what position could the critic take? The only path open to him is that trodden by Mannhardt and Frazer, who maintain that "Death meant originally the dying or dead vegetation." [46] But the support for this proposition is feeble. True, the last sheaf is called "the Dead One," but even if we hold that it is thus designated because the corn spirit is killed, and argue that to glide from the concept of "the Dead One" to the concept of "Death," as applicable to the same entity, is the simplest of operations, it would not follow that the dead corn spirit, generalized into death, and thus taken further away from his concrete embodiment, would be brought back to that embodiment in its living phase, and the still standing corn be made the seat of death. Yet that is what the proposed solution would imply. Possibly, a notion of Death in general was arrived at in some such fashion; possibly, "the concrete notion of the dying tree or dying vegetation would by a . . . process of generalization glide into a notion of death in general; so that the practice of carrying out the dying or dead vegetation in spring, as a preliminary to its revival, would in time widen out into an attempt to banish Death in general from the village or district." [47] But this does not meet the issue. Our problem is not to explain how the peasants we are concerned with came to turn the dead vegetation into Death in general, and employing a figure betraying Death's vegetative origin, indulged in ceremonies designed to remove Death, as barrenness, from their habitations; our problem is to explain how they came to call the dead vegetation Death and yet continue to ascribe life-giving efficacy to its figure. Only one

[45] E. Durkheim, The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life, London, 1915, p. 41.
[46] Wald- und Feldkulte, I, p. 417; The Dying God, p. 253.
[47] The Dying God, p. 253.

of two answers can be given: either Death was originally a deity like Tammuz, and received his name in some such way as Tammuz received the designation "lord of the underworld," or Death was originally a deity like Môt, who in addition to being Death was also a bestower of fruitfulness. Either one of these answers corroborates the position taken in this essay.

Death is a positive force, of course, and not the embodiment of the abstract idea of nothingness. Frazer himself informs us that "the savage . . . conceives of life as an indestructible kind of energy, which when it disappears in one form, must necessarily reappear in another." [48] Death is not a cessation, but an alteration or transmutation of the vital process.[49] It follows that there is no more difficulty in personifying death than there is in personifying any aspect of the realm of nature, and that a state of death which is also a condition of energy, and thus a manifestation of the plasticity of material substance, can with equal ease be regarded as a manifestation of its fertility.

Both Môt and Ba'al are generators of fertility, but that circumstance, however it arose, whether through the superimposition of one cult upon another or not, presents our myth-makers with an involved problem. They know that Môt comes up in vegetable growth and Ba'al goes down in the suffusing rain of heaven. But they also know that the seeds will not germinate and the crops mature, unless Ba'al's watery substance enters the soil, and is sucked up by the growing plants. Since Môt pervades the crops, it is he who draws in Ba'al's life-giving power, and thus quickened, rises into the light. But Môt is male, and is not the rain-god's son; the vital energy of Ba'al cannot be depicted, therefore, as impregnating the corn, conceived of as belonging to the opposite sex, or as entering the earth, pictured as a mother, to issue in a corn-child. Limited, as they are, by the framework of their cult and the specific shapes of their deities, bound to the worship of both Môt and Ba'al, curbed in the exercise of their imagination by what they see and comprehend of nature's workings — for though mythol-

[48] Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, II, pp. 261–262.

[49] E. Cassirer, Philosophie der Symbolischen Formen, II, Das Mythische Denken, Berlin, 1925, p. 197. See also p. 49.

ogy is an exotic growth, it has its roots in every-day reality, so far as that is understood — our myth-makers can resort to but one solution, a solution made even simpler by the circumstance that the corn-god is also the devouring Death. Ba'al will die with the latter rains — it is not necessary to maintain that Ba'al thus became a dying god — and his energy will enter into the being of Môt, who will then increase and flourish as the grain. The rabbinic explanation that *malqôš*, the latter rain, is so designated "because it fills the grain in its stalks," [50] while philologically artificial, reflects the received opinion, of which Ba'al's absorption by Môt is one mythological form.

But absorption of the rain is not enough to cause the upsurge and expansion of the plants. Môt's growth in the fields depends also on the fostering, beneficent heat of the sun, here personified as the female divinity Šapaš. Tammuz, too, as the corn, rises from the lower depths, when the skies become brighter and the increasing ardor of the sun warms the earth into activity.[51] Môt's life as the grain works in the warmed and moistened soil. In his days of triumph, soon to be cut short by the successful attack of 'Anat, bereaved of Ba'al, her brother, and desperately searching for a way to bring him back, Môt has within him the potency of 'Al'eyan, and above him the glowing warmth of the sun, betokening love. And he boasts:

> I devoured 'Al'eyan Ba'al.
> I made him a lamb in my mouth;
> As a kid in the opening of my gullet was he crushed.[52]
> The light of the gods, Šapaš, glows,[53]
> The heavens blaze with love of Bn 'Elm Môt.[54]

In engulfing the life-force of Ba'al and making its virtue a part of his essence, Môt performs an act fully in accord with primitive and ancient theories of the conversion of vital energy, of which cannibalism and the various forms of theophagy are

[50] Ta'anit, 6a.

[51] S. H. Langdon, Tammuz and Ishtar, pp. 22, 31.

[52] For the meaning of *ḫṭ'a*, see the discussion of W. F. Albright, BASOR 82, pp. 47-48.

[53] For this translation, see A. Goetze, "The Tenses of Ugaritic," JAOS, Vol. LVIII, p. 272.

[54] Following H. L. Ginsberg, Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society, 1934, p. 247. I AB ii 21 ff.

the most obvious manifestations.[55] Concerning the dualism of absorption and efflorescence in the functioning of the deity of death and grain, we have the Egyptian hymn to the god of sleep and vegetation, in the last line of which the first word, as shown by its determinative, is certainly connected with the grain, though the word itself is unknown.

> O (thou) the Lord of Sleep upon his bed,
> whose limbs (?) are serpents.
> The guardian whose sleep is not,
> the wanderer, who does not rest.
> He eats millions, he devours millions.[56]
> His grain is millions.[57]

We now have before us the conditions which confront Ba'al at the time of the building of his temple. He is the Ba'al of a land which, in Biblical phrase, "drinketh water as the rain of heaven cometh down." And he himself is that rain. Only as a result of his activity will the ground yield her fruit. If Ba'al be shut up, so that there is no rain, the fields will waste away. But if Ba'al functions, he will die, and though the ground will yield the corn, that corn will be Môt. Little wonder, then, that Ba'al views the prospect with distaste. If Môt could be suppressed, and he could take over Môt's functions in addition to his own, then divine life would indeed be pleasant. After some difficulty, he has received substantial recognition in the shape of a temple, consecrated in great state and with much jubilation on his part and on the part of his sister and consort,

[55] Concerning rain specifically, we have the practice of the Zulu rain-maker who, to preserve his power as controller of meteorological phenomena, eats heaven and absorbs its vital energy by consuming the warm flesh of a bullock struck by lightning (Canon Callaway, The Religious System of the Amazulu, London, 1870, pp. 380–381), and the Mashona custom of soaking the seed-corn in the blood of the slain chief to infuse it with his potency (C. G. Seligman, Egypt and Negro Africa, London, 1934, p. 31). In the Festival of Hoeing the Earth at Busiris, the earth is hoed with the blood of the companions of Set, who was a form of Ba'al (H. Grapow, Religiöse Urkunden, Leipzig, 1916, Vol. II, p. 50). And Set's power was employed in the "opening of the mouth" of Osiris, his thigh being represented by the thigh of a bull, and his very substance being used in the form of an instrument made of the ore drawn from his person (K. Sethe, Dramatische Texte zu altaegyptischen Mysterienspielen, pp. 231 ff.).

[56] The grain demon captured in the last sheaf was, interestingly enough, regarded in European folklore as a voracious feeder. Mythologische Forschungen aus dem Nachlasse von Wilhelm Mannhardt, Strassburg, 1884, p. 27.

[57] S. Schott, op. cit., p. 188.

'Anat, to whose drive and persistence he owes so much. Not only is he for the moment supreme atmospherically; he now has a sanctuary to give him stability and a feeling of permanence. We understand that he is still a dying god, just as Set remains a dying god though he is described as having "power over his enemies" in the days when there are "storms and rains upon the earth." [58] But Ba'al himself, portrayed with human traits, is buoyed up with the hope that it may no longer be necessary for him to be humiliated by death.

> Ba'al dwells in his houses.
> No king, yea, no kingdom
> of the earth shall cause (his) rule to cease.
> A messenger I shall surely [59] send to Bn
> 'Elm Môt, an emissary to Ydd
> 'El Xzr. Let Môt keep (himself)[60]
> in his tomb, let Ydd conceal himself in
> his chamber. I alone am he who will
> rule over the gods to fatten
> gods and men, to satisfy
> the multitudes of the earth.[61]

Ba'al, it is to be noted, concedes that Môt is a bestower of fruitfulness. There is no implication in his speech that Môt represents sterility or blight. The purport of his words is that he wishes now to make the underworld god a sterile force, a king of death exclusively. Môt is to remain in his tomb and chamber, act solely as lord of the underworld, and leave such upperworld manifestations as the grain to Ba'al. Ba'al's eagerness to eliminate Môt's concurrence in the production of nourishment is humanly understandable, for Môt's concurrence involves his destruction. Ba'al, then, desires to be the only deity to fatten gods and men. Whether his desire is susceptible of practical attainment troubles him no more than the question whether gods and men will survive without the fall of Ba'al's water troubles Môt later on. He will send a messenger to apprize Môt of the new order in the cosmos. His instructions are:

[58] E. A. W. Budge, The Book of the Dead, New York, 1923, p. 205.

[59] Following H. L. Ginsberg's suggestion that *'ol* has here affirmative rather than negative force. Orientalia, Vol. V, p. 181.

[60] Arabic *q-r-'* in this sense. The translation, otherwise, is essentially Ginsberg's.

[61] II AB vii 42 ff.

Then thou shalt surely make thy way
to the mount of Trxzz
to the mount of Trmg
to the mound of the fertile soil [62] of the earth.
Raise the mountain upon the hands,
the netherworld (mountain)[63] upon the palms,
and descend to the understructure
of the earth. Thou wilt be counted among them that
descend into the earth.
Then thou shalt surely make thy way
in the midst of his city
Hmry. Mk is the throne
of his sitting. Ḫḫ the land
of his inheritance.[64]

But Môt in his own sunken realm is always a force to be reckoned with. Also Ba'al has not yet accomplished his task of altering the structure of divine activity. Events are still moving in their accustomed grooves. Môt, who has yet to be informed of Ba'al's intentions, and Šapaš, the great power allied with him, are pursuing their usual course. Ba'al understands how things stand. He is fully aware not only that Môt has an enormous devouring capacity, but also that the fostering warmth of the sun has not been withdrawn from the subterranean god, and he expresses his awareness in a sequence of images which are identical with those Môt himself uses in the day when he exults over his conquest of the rain-god and his own supremacy as the grain. Ba'al, therefore, continues:

and keep watch [65]
O servitor [66] of the gods! Thou
shalt surely draw near to Bn 'Elm
Môt. Let him not make thee
as a lamb in his mouth;
as a kid in the opening of his gullet
wouldst thou be crushed.
The light of the gods, Šapaš, glows,
the heavens blaze with love of Mdd
'Elm Môt.[67]

[62] T. H. Gaster's translation, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1935, p. 38.

[63] Sumerian *ḫilib*, in parallelism with *xr*, the association of mountain with underworld being, of course, obvious.

[64] II AB viii 1 ff.

[65] Imperative of *nxr*, which has this meaning in our texts.

[66] Following T. H. Gaster's suggestion. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1934, p. 711; 1935, p. 27.

[67] II AB viii 14 ff.

And then comes the message the envoy is to deliver, but w possess only its opening lines. These are enough, however, t give us an inkling of its import: the construction of Ba'al' temple is to lead to a revolution in the relations of the gods.[68]

> At the feet of Môt
> prostrate thyself, bow low,
> and honor him, and say
> to Bn 'Elm Môt,
> repeat to Ydd
> 'El Xzr, the word
> of 'Al'eyan Ba'al,
> [the utterance of 'Al'ey Qr]dm
> . . . . . houses I had built.[69]

The message is delivered, and Môt gives the envoy his repl for transmission to Ba'al. The details of the reply elude exac comprehension, because of the number of linguistic variables i the context. Môt makes reference to a power associated wit him — Lotan, the fleet serpent of seven heads. Whether Mô warns Ba'al of reprisals, if the rain-god destroys Lotan, c whether Môt makes the conquest of Lotan a test of Ba'al strength is not clear. That Ba'al is compelled to recognize th might of Môt and his allies is, however, certain.[70] Shorn of h pretensions, he acknowledges his subordination to Môt.

> Hasten! Take word to Bn 'Elm Môt,
> repeat to Ydd 'El Xzr,
> the word of 'Al'eyan Ba'al
> the utterance of 'Al'ey
> Qrdm: Be kind, O Bn 'Elm Môt;
> thy servitor I, and thy bondsman.[71]

Ba'al's submission to Môt is the dramatic expression of th idea that for the good of humanity the rain must ultimately l subservient to the crops.[72] The season of maturing crops an

[68] Cf. Jeremiah 22: 14 f.: "That saith: 'I will build me a wide house and spacio chambers,' and cutteth him out windows, and it is ceiled with cedar, and painted wi vermilion. Shalt thou reign, because thou strivest to excel in cedar?"

[69] II AB viii 26 ff.

[70] I* AB ii 5 f.

[71] I* AB ii 8 ff.

[72] This concrete depiction of the rain's subservience comes out in other guise in tho magical procedures — and mythology in some of its phases is only magic objectified designed to terminate the rain's activity. When the fall of water from the skies co

the harvest is near, and Môt must dominate. But Ba'al's submission is the prelude to his death. In lands, like Canaan, where there is a sharp division between the dry and rainy seasons, the rain must go on from subservience either to disappearance or to death. Both concepts are employed in the description of the period following the month of April, about which time the rain-god stops functioning. There is first Ba'al's death, which takes place shortly before or at the beginning of the harvest. Then come the days when rain is so unusual and so undesired that Samuel presents its occurrence to Israel as a special act of God and one determined by His anger.[73] Then ensues the termination of the harvest. The rite of the last sheaf, as we shall see, has for its climax the resurrection of Ba'al. But the time of the autumn rains has not arrived; Ba'al though alive remains hidden.

The death of Ba'al, then, is quite simply the cessation of rain. But that cessation is inevitable, and in a myth which follows nature so closely in dramatically explaining the fertility of the soil, the disappearance of the special phenomena of the weather-god, and the flourishing of the crops, and the subsequent drying up of the earth, one would expect the inevitability of that end to be recognized. And the death of Ba'al is conceived, whatever the starting-point of the train of events which leads to his demise — even the most rigid determinism must begin with something somewhere indetermined — as ordained and predetermined. There is no dragging down of Ba'al to the underworld by its ruler Môt. Ba'al goes down. He is an expending force in his very essence. He diffuses himself in the atmosphere and spreads over the earth, entering its chambers and passing down towards its foundations, the dwelling place of the dead. With the advent of the clear, bright days, Ba'al has expended himself completely, but his energy is still in the

---

tinues beyond the period desired and thus menaces the crops with destruction, the Berbers catch the rain in an empty egg-shell and, after sealing the shell, bury it in a threshing-floor (E. Westermarck, Ritual and Belief in Morocco, London, 1926, Vol. II, p. 278); in Bilaspore the rain can be imprisoned by filling a vessel with it and burying the vessel under a grinding-mill (J. G. Frazer, The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings, London, 1911, Vol. I, p. 253).

[73] I Samuel 12: 17–18.

earth, for the intensely dry period is to come after the end of the harvest. By a steady process of penetration and through his own activity Ba'al has made himself the victim of Môt in both his manifestations. Môt himself is not passive, but his assimilation of the substance of Ba'al is intertwined with the latter's own operation.

In order to track down the conception of Ba'al's doom as necessary and foreordained, we must explore the scenes preceding his demise, travelling somewhat circuitously. In division I* AB of the myth of 'Al'eyan and Môt we read:

> [I shall bury] thee and place (thee) in the pits
> of the gods (or god) of the earth.[74]

These words, anticipatory of 'Al'eyan's death, are addressed to that god by one whose identity is not immediately apparent because of the broken condition of the tablets. The speaker then goes on:

> and thou, take
> thy clouds, thy wind, thy (?),
> thy rains; with thee thy seven
> servitors, thine eight boars,
> with thee Pdry, daughter of 'Ar,
> with thee Ttṭy, daughter of Rb. Then
> thou shalt surely make thy way to the midst of the mount
> Knkny. Raise the mountain upon the hands,
> the underworld (mountain) upon the palms, and descend
> to the understructure of the earth; thou wilt count thyself
> among them that descend into the earth, and thou wilt know lamentation
> (inanition?)[75]
> when thou art dead. 'Al'eyan Ba'al hearkened.[76]

Thus Ba'al's fate is announced to him, and the god is directed and enjoined to meet it. It is 'Anat who utters the words to which 'Al'eyan hearkens, as we discover on consulting another passage, which describes how she buries 'Al'eyan, just as she

[74] I* AB v 5 f. The first word is partially restored (['*aqbr*]*nk*) on the basis of parallel passages (+ I AB 17 f.; I D iii 111 f., 126 f., 140 f., 146 f.); the phrase is a conventional one in Ugaritic literature.

[75] For the translation "lamentation," see J. A. Montgomery and Z. S. Harris, The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts, Philadelphia, 1935, p. 87; "inanition" is suggested by C. Virolleaud, Syria, Vol. XV, p. 328.

[76] I* AB v 6 ff.

has foretold, after she and 'El have given voice to much noisy lamentation.

> and she buries him; she places him in the pits
> of the gods (or god) of the earth.[77]

Now, Ba'al is the consort of 'Anat, and 'Anat weeps for him when he is dead, and longs for him as a cow longs for her calf and a ewe for her lamb; she attacks and disintegrates Môt, his devourer, thus opening the door to his resurrection.[78] Yet 'Anat is depicted as apprizing Ba'al of his doom and ordering him to meet it; and Ba'al is depicted as obeying without protest — even 'Anat reserves her shrieks for the sequel. The implication is obvious. Both deities are caught in a web of destiny from which they cannot extricate themselves. 'Anat will conquer, and Ba'al will return, but only after the summer has passed, and Nature's time for the rains has arrived. It is an affirmation that the order of nature is superior to the gods who embody and by their action express its processes.[79] It is even possible that Ba'al's resurrection, like his death, was conceived as determined by this same order. 'El seems to take the revival for granted — his lamentation would not militate against this conclusion, of course — for when 'El and 'Athirat, after the death of Ba'al, set up a king in his place, and 'Athirat submits the name of one of her sons, 'El rejects the proposed substitute, saying: "Shall one feeble of strength, rise up against Ba'al, defy Bn Dagon?" To which 'Athirat replies: "Let us make 'Athtar the Terrible (*'rẓ*) king." [80]

It requires no extended proof to recognize that 'Athtar will remain Ba'al's substitute until the latter's return. Môt palpably is not that substitute; he is the grain, but the grain will

[77] + I AB 17 f.

[78] I AB ii 26 ff.

[79] "Von der Rhythmik und Periodik, die schon in allem unmittelbaren Dasein und Leben fühlbar ist, erhebt sich jetzt der Gedanke zur Idee der *Zeitordnung* als einer universellen, alles Sein und Werden beherrschenden *Schicksalsordnung*. Erst in dieser Fassung als Schicksal wird die mythische Zeit zu einer wahrhaft kosmischen Potenz — zu einer Macht, die nicht nur den Menschen, sondern die auch die Dämonen und Götter bindet, weil nur in ihr und kraft ihrer unverbrüchlichen Masse und Normen alles Leben und Wirken der Menschen und selbst der Götter möglich ist." E. Cassirer, op. cit., p. 142.

[80] I AB i 22 f. The translation is H. L. Ginsberg's Orientalia, Vol. V, p. 195.

not stand in the fields until Ba'al's rain once again beats down on them. The dry period, however, will extend until the autumnal change. Also, the days of intensest heat will come after the end of the harvest, which signifies the reaping of Môt. That reaping will occur before the end of June. We cannot consider Môt to be the god of dryness and drought. And there is no reason so to postulate, for Môt does not occupy Ba'al's throne.[81] The occupant of that throne obviously has a function to perform. Since he is described by 'El in terms indicative of opposition to Ba'al, and is depicted as ruling over the land in the absence of rain, and since Ba'al's resumption of his rights betokens the restoration of the watery element in nature, it seems reasonable to conclude that the lord of the rainless sky is 'Athtar the Terrible. 'Athtar is probably lord, also, of the fruits which mature in the period of intense heat and are finally gathered in shortly before the early rains are looked forward to and hoped for to break up the dry ground. It is in the first part of his reign that Môt comes to fruition and is reaped, winnowed and ground.

As we have seen, the time of Ba'al's demise is the period when the grain ripens; that demise is the swallowing of his life-force by the growing crops. As Kronos devoured his children, and Zeus devoured Metis, and the Titans Dionysos, so Môt swallows Ba'al. When Môt boasts to 'Anat that he has the rain-god within him, the end of the harvest, which is marked by the brutal treatment accorded to him by 'Anat, is either a month or months away.[82] During that while the fields of corn gleam with promise of sustenance beneath a clear and cloudless sky. The cleaving of Môt is yet to come with the final gathering of the sheaves. There is no blight, no barrenness here. Let us not

[81] Dussaud (Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, Vol. CXI, p. 33) has drawn an over-simplified picture of the changing fortunes of Môt and Ba'al: according to him the tomb of Ba'al is the same as the tomb of Môt, when either god is in darkness; and the throne of Ba'al is identical with the throne of Môt, when either god is in the light. Apart from all other considerations, Dussaud's depiction of Môt and Ba'al as alternative occupants of the same upperworld throne could stand only if, with Nielsen (Ras Shamra Mythologie und Biblische Theologie, Leipzig, 1936, pp. 67, n. 3, 109), we identify 'Athtar and Môt — an implausible conjecture, to which Dussaud has not committed himself.

[82] I AB ii 26 ff.

exaggerate Ba'al's importance, at least as he appears in our myth. Nature is too much for him; his powers are insufficient, despite his dreams of dominance, to encompass the whole of the agriculturalist's year. Ba'al hurls himself against the bars of an order of things to him distressing, but the order stands firm. In the depiction of Ba'al's restiveness and dissatisfaction there may be a hint of an ultimate switch to a different conception of his functioning, but that conception has not yet emerged. Ba'al is still the rain, with the corn an alien entity, and though his rain must sweep the fields and fill the streams, if the land is not to pine away and the people perish, there comes a time when he is not wanted. As R. Joshua put it: "Is it true of rain that it would be in time whenever it came? Do we not read: If rain falls after Nisan is passed it is a sign of a curse?" [83] When the winter is past, and the rain is over and gone,

> The flowers appear on the earth;
> The time of singing is come.[84]

The lapse of rain is not followed by unpleasantness. Indeed, it is in "the pleasantness of the land Dbr" and amid "the beauty of the field Šḥlmmt" that Ba'al is discovered, dead.[85] He is a great god; lamentation, usually uttered in terms of exaggerated praise today as well as in other days, is fitting and proper; his water means life to gods and men; the prospect of his subsequent return will be viewed with delight. But "to every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose." [86] Now we are taken up with the harvest, which Ba'al's continued presence would spoil. 'Anat may be overcome with a persistent sense of desolation, but though the farmer may sympathize with her, it would turn our myth into an egregiously stupid fancy, unrelated to the life of its place and time, to suppose that he gathers in what will finally be bread with a deep feeling of distress or discomfort because of the absence of rain. Even 'El in our myth, as Dussaud points out, soon leaves off lamenting for Ba'al. And as for 'Athirat and the assembly of her numerous sons, not even wisps of a pall of gloom hang over their heads.

[83] Ta'anit 2b. Cf. 3b; Proverbs 26:1.
[84] Canticles 2:11–12. [85] I* AB vi 5 ff. [86] Ecclesiastes 3:1.

Let 'Athirat rejoice indeed,
and her sons! 'Elat and the
band of her companions! For dead is 'Al'eyan
Ba'al, for perished is Zebûl, Lord
of the Earth.[87]

A world of perpetual rain would be a world of disaster. 'Anat's grief is the grief of love, it is not the sorrow of humanity. She may plead with Môt: "Thou, Môt, give up my brother"; [88] she may describe her plight. But she is not permitted to attain the promise of satisfaction of her yearning until the last sheaf is cut. Our myth-makers are agriculturalists. Môt flourishes until the harvesting draws to an end, when 'Anat seizes him, as we have seen, he having apparently receded to the last sheaf in harmony with the belief universal in folklore.[89]

She seized
Bn 'Elm Môt. With a sword
she clove him; with a sieve she winnowed
him; with fire she burned him;
between mill-stones she ground him; in the field
she strewed him, so that the birds might eat
his flesh.[90]

But we cannot speak without qualification of the destruction of Môt. The corn-god is understood as being killed at the reaping or threshing,[91] but Môt himself is Death. However complete the disintegration of any of his manifestations, the result can only be a relegation of the god to his sunken realm. Death can be a dying god only in a Pickwickian sense; [92] 'Anat's destruction of Môt is the destruction of one of his modes or phases, not of his substance.

'Anat's act serves an immediate practical purpose, not directly connected with the restoration of the rain. It absolves

[87] I AB i 11 f.

[88] I AB ii 11.

[89] W. Mannhardt, Wald- und Feldkulte, I, pp. 212 f.; Mythologische Forschungen. p. 19; J. G. Frazer, Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, I, pp. 133–167.

[90] I AB ii 30 ff.

[91] Cf. J. G. Frazer, Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, I, pp. 223–225.

[92] The Melanesians tell us that men once thought they had Death lying dead among them, his ghost expelled by the sound of the conch shell; but when they raised the pall which covered his corpse, they discovered that Death had eluded them, leaving his skeleton behind; Death himself had gone back to his underworld. J. G. Frazer, The Belief in Immortality and the Worship of the Dead, I, pp. 83–84.

humanity of all responsibility for the outrage upon Môt. The death of the rain occurs without the aid or connivance of man, and hence no blame can fall upon him for the destruction of Ba'al. But the reaping of the grain is an operation which requires the collaboration or complicity of humanity.[93] Sending Môt back to his subterranean realm is sufficient violation of his person. Such use of force is an offence which requires expiation. If the reaper acts as surrogate for 'Anat, however, no guilt attaches to him.[94] The responsibility is shifted to her, and she is justified in her aggression, because Môt is the devourer of her brother. In this way crime and punishment are mythologically interwoven with a process which is at once a practical necessity and a trespass, and the participants in the cult, who worship Môt as well as Ba'al, are absolved of all blame. The women, or the people, of Ugarit may possibly have wept for Môt as evidence of their innocence and the destructive operation of a superior power, as the women at Ḥarrân wept for Tammuz, cruelly murdered, ground and scattered in the wind by his lord. Père Lagrange suggested that wailing of this general type was designed to free the harvesters from liability for wrong;[95] we can now supplement his discussion with a clear illustration of the device by which the burden of responsibility could be placed upon a destructive agent of superhuman authority.

The primary purpose of 'Anat's attack is to release her brother, as is sufficiently obvious from the text itself, which introduces the attack with words descriptive of 'Anat's longing for him. But how is this release brought about? In a myth like ours, which is dramatically conceived, we should expect a dramatic act rather than a magical rite to be the instrument of Ba'al's restoration. By "dramatic act" we do not mean an act totally severed in idea from magic. If to bring the rain, a medicine-man breaks open the egg-shell in which he caught the rain, when he wished the weather to be dry, he is performing a

[93] Cf. Adonis, Attis and Osiris, II, pp. 45–48.

[94] On analogous shifting of responsibility, cf. J. G. Frazer, The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings, I, p. 58; II, pp. 18, 36–37. Cf. F. C. Burkitt, The Religion of the Manichees, Cambridge, 1925, p. 45.

[95] Études sur les Religions Semitiques, Paris, 1905, p. 307.

magical rite.[96] If, to rescue the rain-god, a goddess breaks open the prison-house in which the rain-god is held captive, she does something very like and for a purpose practically identical. But whatever the relation to the magical rite in subject and function, her achievement is dramatic. The magician who deals with natural phenomena presses nature to bring about certain natural occurrences; but nature, as it is mythologically conceived, can accomplish the same ends on the objective impersonal side; and it is that objective side which a myth like ours dramatically presents. There will of course be similarities, but there will also be significant divergences. We know that rain-charms, involving the use of water, are associated with the rite of the last sheaf.[97] We can also accept Westermarck's conclusion that ceremonies involving the grain or agricultural implements and operations alone, and dispensing with the use of water, constitute rain-making or rain-inducing procedures.[98] Curtiss does not tell us that "the bride of God" — the winnowing-fork clad in women's clothes — carried by Greek Christians in Palestine in ceremonies designed to relieve the drought, was drenched with water or thrown into a stream,[99] and though Frazer maintains that the ceremonies "would hardly be complete without this feature," [100] Westermarck is correct in citing Curtiss in support of his view,[101] for Frazer himself informs us of the belief that women can bring the rain by ploughing or pretending to plough, a rite unattended by the use of water.[102]

And since such periodical rites which "demand nothing more of nature than that it follow its ordinary course" [103] produce therefore the effect of the compliance of the elements, this connection in magical procedure of the return of rain with the

[96] E. Durkheim, op. cit., p. 34.

[97] W. Mannhardt, Wald- und Feldkulte, I, pp. 214, 409, 412 f., 419; Mythologische Forschungen, p. 352; J. G. Frazer, Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, I, pp. 134–135, 146, 170, 221, 224–225; Adonis, Attis and Osiris, I, pp. 237–239.

[98] Op. cit., II, pp. 273–274.

[99] Primitive Semitic Religion Today, Chicago, 1902, p. 114.

[100] The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings, I, p. 276.

[101] Op. cit., II, p. 273.

[102] The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings, I, pp. 282–284.

[103] E. Durkheim, op. cit., p. 361.

destruction of the corn, or with implements employed to sow the seed or utilize the harvest, means that on the objective side it will be paralleled by the idea of an essential interactivity between rain and corn mythologically conceived and portrayed.[104] One aspect of this interactivity we have already traced. In the light of the basic idea, and with the depiction of Ba'al becoming absorbed in Môt as expressive of one mode of the underlying interactivity of rain and corn, we can conclude with something of assurance that the release of Ba'al, when given dramatic embodiment, will take the form of a variant on a theme prevailing "from Greenland to South Africa, from Delphi to the Solomon Islands, from Brittany to the shores of Lake Superior" — that of "the swallowing of many persons by a being from whose maw they return alive and in good case."[105] Of Marduk it is written, "the 'lord' who at the Akîtu Festival sits within Tiâmat," and as Ebeling explains, Bêl is swallowed by her, he is dead.[106] He is also released, and that can only be from the inner parts of Tiâmat. So it is in different form with Ba'al. As the eye of Horus is rescued undigested from the stomach of the Set-animal,[107] so is Ba'al set free when Môt is cut open by 'Anat.[108]

[104] We have here a peculiarly apt and illuminating illustration of the "mystic relation" emphasized by Lévy-Bruhl in his analyses of "primitive mentality." "It is not merely an artless and erroneous application of the principle of causality. It is not only direct anteriority in time which makes the connection between one fact and another. The sequence perceived or remarked may suggest the connection, but the connection itself is not in any way confused with this sequence. It consists in a mystic relation which the primitive represents to himself — and of which he is convinced as soon as he represents it to himself — between the antecedent and the consequent: the first having the power to produce the second and make it apparent." How Natives Think, London, 1926, p. 74.

[105] A. Lang, Myth, Ritual and Religion, London and New York, 1913, Vol. I, p. 295.

[106] Tod und Leben, I, p. 25.

[107] A. Moret, Le rituel du culte divin journalier en Égypte, Paris, 1902, pp. 32–35.

[108] The king of the rain among some tribes on the Upper Nile is subjected to similar punishment. When the people desire rain, and no rain comes, despite the demands made upon the king, "they rip up his belly, in which he is believed to keep the storms." J. G. Frazer, The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings, II, p. 2. Cf. I, pp. 295, 310. Kronos swallowed the thunder and lightning in the shape of a stone; when he spewed it up, the force of thunder and lightning was released, and Zeus, probably identical with the stone, was able to function. G. Murray, "Anthropology in the Greek Epic Tradition outside Homer," in R. R. Marett, ed., Anthropology and the Classics, Oxford, 1908, pp. 85–86.

The harvesting is now completed; Môt has been dispatched to his sunken abode; and Ba'al is again alive. It is an echo of "the disposition of the primitive mind to regard, as actual and already accomplished, a future event which, for mystic reasons, seems to be certain." "Magic operations which are infallible have been performed" and "the decision has already been arrived at in the realm of the invisible." [109] But Ba'al's rains are yet to come; not until October will the land be moistened and again made fertile. He is no longer dead, but he is still hidden from the sight of gods and men. 'El looks forward to the rain-god's reappearance, but "in a vision"; naught is yet seen.[110] The fields, denuded of the grain, now lie baking in the sun, and will so remain throughout the rainless summer. Dryer and dryer will the naked furrows become, and the dust will be mute evidence of the need for Ba'al.[111] Šapaš is to search for him.[112] Dramatic value is thus given two ideas prevalent in antiquity: that rain is distilled from the vapor the sun draws up from the earth, and that summer and winter are caused by changes the sun makes in the course of its heavenly travels.[113] The shortening of the days and the recession of the sun as the autumnal equinox draws near, and with it the rains, may also be taken as an indication of the sun's devotion to the task of finding Ba'al.

We are now in the dry portion of the Syrian year. The bare stubble-fields lie under the dominion of 'Athtar, who, as we have seen, sits on Ba'al's throne, and has been aptly described by 'El as one capable of defying Ba'al, the embodiment of moisture. When the rain does return, Ba'al's first act is to break up and crack the parched soil, thus preparing the land for man's ploughing and sowing. He does battle with 'Athtar, and it is in this conflict, and not in the succeeding struggle with

[109] L. Lévy-Bruhl, Primitive Mentality, London, 1923, p. 327.

[110] I AB iii 4 ff.

[111] I AB iv 25 f.

[112] I AB iv 44.

[113] O. Gilbert, Die Meteorologischen Theorien des griechischen Altertums, Leipzig, 1907, pp. 405-406, 414-415, 442, 489; cf. Job 36: 27–28; Herodotus, II, 25, tr. A. D. Godley, Loeb Classical Library, London and New York, 1931, Vol. I, p. 303; Cicero, De Natura Deorum, II, xv, xix; III, xiv, ed. cit., pp. 161, 171, 321.

Môt, that we have the Syrian analogue to the European battle of summer and winter,[114] drought being to Syria, of course, what frost is to European lands. In the account of the fight in which Ba'al engages on his return, the reference is palpably to 'Athtar.

> Ba'al seized the son of 'Athirat.
> The great one he smote on the shoulder;
> the brilliant (?)[115] one he smote on the joint (?);[116]
> [He drove him] from the seat of his kingdom,
> [from the seat (?)] from the throne of his dominion.[117]

It is after 'Athtar is defeated that Môt reappears [118] to engage the returned king of the rain in combat. And Môt's first words are words of complaint. He complains of 'Anat's violation of his person. We cannot say, with most of the scholars who have committed themselves on the question, that the utterance of Môt is a seeming threat to subject Ba'al to the same burning and grinding process he has undergone at the hands of 'Anat. Philologically, such an interpretation is not forced upon us, and we may therefore justly request that mythological consistency be adhered to. The god of rain will not be subjected either in magic or in myth to the same detailed agricultural mode of death to which the god of grain is compelled to submit. He may be burned, and he may be split in half, and he

[114] J. G. Frazer, The Dying God, pp. 254–261.

[115] Following the suggestion of W. F. Albright, Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society, 1932, p. 203.

[116] From *ṣmd* "to bind, join," in parallelism with *ktp* "shoulder."

[117] I AB v 1 ff. Restored on the basis of V AB iv 46 f.

[118] According to the text (I AB v 7 ff.), Môt reappears in the seventh year. We need not take the seven-year period literally. In Ugaritic literature seven is a number which, to use the words of Levy-Bruhl, does not "serve the purpose of arithmetical calculation"; it is "felt and not conceived." (How Natives Think, pp. 222, 223. Cf. pp. 206, 217.) At Friedingen on the Danube, Mannhardt tells us, the vegetation demon of the previous year, grown old and weak, and impoverished by the long winter months, is called "the poor old man who has lived in the forest for seven years." (Wald- und Feldkulte, I, pp. 350, 358.) It may be that the advent of the rains, which in the *milieu* of our texts was the great power of restoration and revivification, whether of the dead or of the earth and its products, endues Môt with fresh energy, and thus causes him to come up from below, eager to do battle with Ba'al. Cf. I. Goldziher, "Wasser als Dämonen abwehrendes Mittel," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 1910, pp. 45 f.; P. Karge, Rephaim, Paderborn, 1918, pp. 570 ff.; A. Parrot, Le "Refrigerium" dans l'au-delà, Paris, 1937, pp. 52–53; Ta'anit 2a.

may be broken up, or otherwise dealt with in ways broadly suggestive of the death of the corn-god, but he will not be slain by means of an exact representation of the different stages of the process by which the standing grain becomes bread. It would be bad medicine, unless the rain-god had absorbed the features of the corn-god, a fusion which occurred at various times and places. But there is nothing of the corn or of the earth in Ba'al's constitution, as he is portrayed in our texts. In the passage in question, we can divide the combination of letters, *pht*, into *p*, signifying "and," and thus it appears in other passages, and *ht*, signifying "behold," and thus it also appears in other places in our texts. The word *'lk*, which has been translated "upon thee," can with equal propriety and simplicity be translated "because of thee." We thus obtain the following reading, in which the restorations made by Bauer[119] are justified by the original description of 'Anat's assault:

Bn 'Elm Môt
raised his voice to
Ba'al and cried out: Because of thee . . . ,
and behold, disgrace because of thee, and behold,
a winnowing [with the sieve because of thee, and behold, a cleaving] with the
sword because of thee,
and behold, a burning with fire
because of thee [and behold, a gr]inding between mill-
stones because of thee, and behold, . . . with . . .
because of thee, and behold . . .
in the field because of thee, and behold,
a strewing in the sea![120]

Môt is as human as we found Ba'al to be. His grievance is uppermost in his mind, as was Ba'al's in the earlier stages of our myth. The outrage upon Môt was committed because of Ba'al; he will now dispose of the rain-god, stop his rains, and thus nullify the end 'Anat's violence was designed to achieve. There are gaps in the text, but the thread of Môt's intention is clear, and leads us to a scene of furious combat.

[119] Die alphabetischen Keilschrifttexte von Ras Shamra, Berlin, 1936, p. 46.
[120] I AB v 10 ff.

Môt burned like a hot
coal. Superior proved Ba'al, superior. Môt charged
him like a buffalo. Superior proved Ba'al,
superior. Môt bit him like
a snake. Superior proved Ba'al, superior. Môt
kicked (?) him like a charger. Inferior
proved Ba'al, inferior.[121]

Môt is too strong for the rain-god, but he cannot be permitted to prevail. The rain must fall and Ba'al must function. There is a greater force than either god working in our myth and controlling the warring deities, as the phenomena of the seasons are controlled in less concrete descriptions; it is the order of nature, which permeates our myth, not as a personification, but in the same way that the necessities of a predetermined plot pervade and govern a work of art. Šapaš intervenes, and puts an end to the conflict.[122] Môt, no more than Ba'al, can check or alter the course of nature. Significantly enough, it is the sun, whose warmth and glow foster Môt and bring him to fruition as the corn, who is here assigned the task of preventing him from exceeding his proper measures. The days of deepest darkness are approaching, and the time for Môt to flourish is not yet. Šapaš was conceived, we learn, as spending the long winter nights in the underworld.

Thou shalt have authority over the shades,
O Šapaš, thou shalt have authority over the 'elnym.
The gods are thine associates (?), behold, Môt
is thine associate (?), KTr thy friend
and Ḫss thy companion.[123]

We may assume, then, that when Šapaš intervenes and reverses Môt's fortune, she draws him down with her to his sunken realm, or goes with him to lessen his despair.

But if Môt is thus to be balked when he is seemingly on the verge of victory, what purpose does the conflict serve in our myth, which is patterned so carefully on the rise, decline and interplay of natural events? Is it an inherited irrelevancy which piety feels constrained to preserve? It may be that, and

[121] I AB v 16 ff. Following Goetze's translation of these lines, JAOS, Vol. LVIII, p. 271.

[122] I AB vi 22 ff.

[123] I AB vi 44 ff.

there are incidents in the myth which leave us with the same impression. Or is it a bit of unnecessary fireworks to delight the vulgar? Can we look in nature and the calendar of the farmer's year for a clue to its meaning?

The probability is that Môt is brought up each autumn, after the parched land has been broken up by Ba'al for the ploughing and sowing, because Môt as the corn-god is not only the last sheaf but also the seed. The seed-corn is, of course, a continuance of the entity embodied in the last sheaf,[124] and the resurrection of the corn-spirit in time for ploughing is what we should expect.[125] The seed must then be in the upperworld for planting, and since the god is in the seed, he, too, must be on earth, and cannot remain hidden in its depths.[126] Môt as seed corn rises full of energy — are not potent crops desired? — still enraged by the memory of what he as the last sheaf has suffered, and he is able to speak face to face with Ba'al because the husbandman has him in the open for insertion in the furrows. True, he will be buried again in the field, but we already know that Môt is replaced in his subterranean dwelling, after Šapaš interposes and halts his struggle with Ba'al.

But why the combat? It may be that its introduction is to be attributed to the felt necessity of justifying the burial of Môt as the seed. We have independent evidence showing that justification of man's action in such cases is required.[127] Sowing the seed is a mode of interment, when the corn is god. A violent fight is therefore conceived, which, if not terminated, will entail the stoppage of rain. Môt must be sent down in order to permit Ba'al to function. There is no sacrilege of which the farmer must purge himself, then, in placing the god in the furrows. A superior authority, Šapaš, has thus decreed.

It may also be that the description of the struggle and the

[124] W. Mannhardt, Wald- und Feldkulte, I, p. 213; J. G. Frazer, Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, I, pp. 134–135, 205, 278, 301, 304; II, p. 20.

[125] W. Mannhardt, Wald- und Feldkulte, I, p. 213, II, p. 322; Mythologische Forschungen, pp. 26, 29, 30.

[126] At sowing-time, according to European peasant practice and belief, the spirit of vegetation "goes out again to the fields to resume his activity as animating force." J. G. Frazer, Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, II, p. 7.

[127] J. G. Frazer, Adonis, Attis and Osiris, II, pp. 40–45.

recital of Môt's final superiority to Ba'al is in its way as much an anticipation, and hence a determination, of the successful growth of the corn, which will depend on ultimate conquest of rain, as the Malay practice of planting maize with a full stomach,[128] or the East Prussian custom of chopping the earth with an axe at sowing time so that the cornstalks may become so sturdy that the use of the same instrument will be required in reaping.[129] We may say that since Môt is the seed, and the seed must be heavily charged with energy if the corn is to flourish luxuriantly, the conflict with Ba'al serves the purpose of making manifest the great power which will work and be lodged in the crops. Ability to fight is the surest sign of potency. That is why the flesh and blood of an enemy killed in battle is considered very strong medicine by primitive man. Indeed, so great is its efficacy that "with it the seeds are smeared in order to ensure a good harvest."[130] When Môt goes down, he must go down strong. The more virile he is, the better. This, too, may be the explanation of Ba'al's commerce with the heifer, after he has been directed to descend to his death, and before his dead body is discovered;[131] Ba'al, the fertilizing rain, is pulsating with potency, before entering as a dynamic ingredient into the substance of the corn. For the same reason Môt is imagined as actually overcoming the fierce resistance of Ba'al, and then checked, to descend in the full tide of his vigor, much as divine kings are slain before old age and disease have been able to exhaust their energy, so that their souls may be transferred to their successors while still powerful. It is the mythological version in masculine terms of the Greek and Roman practice of sacrificing pregnant cows to the corn and the earth so that a "full earth" might be the result of offering a "full victim";[132] or of the Peruvian custom of slaying the Mother of the Maize, who was the instrument by which the corn grew and multiplied, if she disclosed signs of weakness or confessed that she felt feeble, lest the seed of maize decay or perish.[133]

[128] J. G. Frazer, The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings, I, p. 136.

[129] Ibid., p. 137.

[130] J. G. Frazer, Aftermath, a Supplement to The Golden Bough, New York, 1937, p. 40. [131] I* AB v 18 ff. [132] Ovid, Fasti, IV 633–634.

[133] J. G. Frazer, Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild, I, p. 174.

Môt descends into the earth, a ferocious warrior, boiling over with fury and energy, thus giving promise of a rich harvest of tall, sturdy corn. Ba'al spreads over the earth as fructifying rain in a majestic sweep of life-giving waters. It is now the time when the wet element is lord. The wheel has come full-circle. But the complex pattern of the order of nature still constitutes the frame of things, setting bounds to the gods of nature who would be boundless, and limiting them when they would overstep their measures. Though Ba'al again dominates, the upshot of his triumph, we may be sure, will be the rise of the corn-god Môt.

> The rain cometh down and the snow from heaven,
> And returneth not thither,
> Except it water the earth,
> And make it bring forth and bud,
> And give seed to the sower and bread to the eater.[134]

Thus we see that while it is in one sense true to say with Moret [135] that Môt and Ba'al are rival and at the same time complementary deities, or with Dussaud [136] that their vicissitudes represent the alternation of the seasons, one god being up while the other is down, it is not exact. Such statements fail to convey an adequate idea of the complexity of the process by which the two gods are brought together, interfused, separated, and presumably reunited in moving rhythms of constant regularity. Ba'al, the expending force, and Môt, the absorbing, are not rivals for the same throne. Môt is not Ba'al's successor in a simple alternation; he is Ba'al's absorber, for without the rain he cannot come to fruition in the harvest. He needs the weather-god to correct his own inadequacy. Without moisture he is only the god of the dead. Ba'al, on the other hand, cannot give humanity the cereals necessary for subsistence, if he remains above ground, and does not descend to the depths of Môt's dwelling. If his fecundating rain is to culminate in the grain, Ba'al must penetrate to the subterranean foundations of the earth — and that is what the artificers of our myth

[134] Isaiah 55:10.

[135] "Rituels agraires de l'ancien Orient à la lumière des nouveaux textes de Ras Shamra," Mélanges Capart, Bruxelles, 1935, pp. 339 f.

[136] Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, Vol. CXI, p. 33.

understood as death. We are dealing with a process organically conceived, and not with a spatial departmentalization of the universe. The conflict of the two gods is not a collision in a straight line or a mechanical elevation and subsidence above and below a single plane, but a complicated movement of outpouring, absorption, negation, decomposition, and renewal, in the course of which Môt breaks through the crust of the earth as the crops, and is broken up as the threshed and winnowed grain, and Ba'al goes into the rising, burgeoning Môt and then is released at the end of the harvest and returns, albeit slowly, to the atmosphere whence he came. The rain is not only the medium of Ba'al's indwelling, but also that of his outgoing. The earth is not only the medium into which Môt withdraws as a down-dragging devourer; it is also the substance from which, when warmed and moistened, he bursts forth as a lavish producer. 'Anat not only cuts open Môt, the devourer of her brother; she also sends Ba'al, her brother, to the cavernous realms of death. Šapaš, the sun, not only brings Môt to fruition by the warmth of her rays; she also goes in search of Ba'al, and restores him to his proper place by drawing up moisture from the fresh waters and the ocean. The cunning of nature is reflected in ingenious mythological contrivance, and its periodic regularity in the subordination of the gods embodying its elements, themselves mutable, to a neatly devised plan.

RELIGIOUS ENTHUSIASM AND SEPARATISM IN COLONIAL NEW ENGLAND

MAURICE W. ARMSTRONG
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

ENGLISH SECTARIES OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

THOMAS UNDERHILL, a citizen of London during the Commonwealth, described that period of English history as "Hell Broke Loose." [1] Partly as a result of Anabaptist influence, and partly as a continuation of the indigenous Lollard movement, large numbers of persons in every part of England separated themselves from the Established Church and formed themselves into independent religious societies. Some of these groups were very eccentric in their beliefs and practices. Thomas Edwards, their bitter opponent, made a Catalogue of "the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and Pernicious Practices . . . vented and acted in England" between the years 1642 and 1646, which he called, Gangraena. In it he distinguishes no less than two hundred and ten errors which were held by one or other of the sixteen groups into which he divides the sectaries.[2] The sixteen were, "Independents, Brownists, Chiliasts or Millenaries, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Manifestarians or Arminians, Libertines, Familists, Enthusiasts, Seekers and Waiters, Perfectists, Socinians, Arians, Anti-Trinitarians, Anti-Scripturalists, Sceptics and Quietists." The Parliamentary army especially abounded with men whose "great religion" was "liberty of conscience and liberty of preaching." [3] G. P. Gooch and others have shown how deeply the roots of modern democracy are embedded in the religious struggles of these seventeenth century sects.[4] Most of them disappeared with the Commonwealth, or

[1] Thomas Underhill, Hell Broke Loose, or a History of the Quakers (London, 1660)

[2] Thomas Edwards, Gangraena, Third edition (London, 1646), Part I, 13 ff.; Part II, 116.

[3] Ibid., Part I, 14.

[4] G. P. Gooch, English Democratic Ideas in the XVII Century (Cambridge, 1927); Robert Barclay, The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth, 2nd ed. (London, 1877); R. M. Jones, Mysticism and Democracy in the English Commonwealth (Cambridge, 1932), esp. Ch. V.

were absorbed in the rising Quaker movement, but certain fundamental principles for which they stood continued to exist and to mold public opinion.

They insisted that religion was futile unless it produced a new man, *homo novus*. Salvation could not come second-handed, or by a forensic doctrine of Atonement. It could only come by the Spirit of Love entering into a man and raising human nature to its divine possibilities.[5] "Bread and wine are silly things, where the heart is not led further," wrote Roger Brierly, a Seeker, discussing the Sacraments.[6] Men should be free to practice the religion of their choice and to follow the leadings of their divine "openings" and "insights." Education and human wisdom were but, "rotten crutches to support lameness." [7] The ordinary clergy were despised, and ignorant laymen often took it upon themselves to preach. "It is a thousand pities," wrote Dr. Daniel Featley in 1645,

> "that now in the Noon-tide of the Gospel, such Owls and Bats should fly abroad everwhere, and flutter in our Churches . . I wonder that our Doors, Posts, and Walls sweat not, upon which such Notes as these have been of late affix'd, 'On such a Day, such a Brewer's Clerk Exerciseth, such a Taylor Expoundeth, such a Waterman Teacheth.'" [8]

In short, the great outburst of religious enthusiasm in the mid-seventeenth century was an attempt of "the common man" to create a church after his own heart.[9] In that attempt as in every popular movement, there were extremists. Some of the so-called "Ranters" were entirely irresponsible, claiming any impulse or inclination to be the will of God, and completely disowning any outward helps, tests or standards.[10] Most of the sectaries, however, were honest seekers after a new dispensation. They were highly tinged with the mysticism of Jacob Boehme. They waited in silence and expectancy the time when sin would be eradicated from human nature, and

[5] Jones, op. cit., 127–129.

[6] Quoted, Ibid., 83.

[7] Quoted, Ibid., 89.

[8] Daniel Featley, The Dippers Dipt. (Originally pub. London, 1645, seventh edition 1660), Preface.

[9] Jones, Mysticism and Democracy, 147.

[10] Ibid., 132 ff.

their lives would be united with God in a life of love and truth here upon earth.

The Sectaries in New England

It is not surprising to discover that some of the English sectaries early found their way to New England, where the noble experiment of a "Plantation of Religion" had begun. Only the names of a few of the most outspoken ringleaders have been preserved, but there can be little doubt that there were many others. Indeed, it is a well known fact that the so-called *Antinomian* followers of Mrs. Ann Hutchinson almost succeeded in overturning the "New England Way" in 1636–37, and in substituting in its stead a more elastic and tolerant polity.[11] Captain Edward Johnson of Woburn, who arrived in the Bay Colony at the height of the Antinomian Controversy, warned his fellow *saints* against seven grave errors, which may be assumed, therefore, to have existed in the colony at the time.

First, the Gortonists, who deny the Humanity of Christ, and most blasphemously and proudly profess themselves to be personally Christ.

Second, the Papists, who with (almost) equal blasphemy and pride, prefer their own merits and works of Superogation as equal with Christ's Invaluable Death and Sufferings.

Third, the Familists, who depend upon rare Revelations and forsake the sure Word of Christ.

Fourth, the Seekers, who deny the Churches and Ordinances of Christ.

Fifth, the Antinomians, who deny the Moral Law to be the Rule of Christ.

Sixth, the Anabaptists, who deny Civil Government to be proved of Christ.

Seventh, the Prelacy, who will have their own Injunctions submitted unto the Churches of Christ.[12]

On the whole, this seems to be a very fair summary of the main tenets of the sectaries. Samuel Gorton, who appears to have been a typical Ranter, was banished from the colony in 1644, and settled with his followers at Warwick, Rhode Island.[13]

[11] This is the real historical significance of the famous controversy according to C. F. Adams, Antinomianism in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay (Boston, 1894), xiv–xv.

[12] Edward Johnson, Wonder Working Providence of Sion's Saviour in New England (1654), W. F. Poole ed. (Andover, 1867), 8.

[13] Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi Americana, T. Robbins ed. (Hartford, 1853), II, 505; John Winthrop, Journal History of New England, 1630–1649, J. K. Hosmer, ed. (New York, 1908), II, 145 ff.

Mrs. Ann Hutchinson was condemned by the first Synod of Elders in New England, at Newtown in 1637, on eighty-two charges, "some blasphemous, others erroneous and all unsafe." [14] Governor Winthrop, who was active in the prosecution, classified her followers as "Antinomians, Familists and Libertines." [15] Undoubtedly many of the doctrines taught by Mrs. Hutchinson and her brother-in-law, Reverend John Wheelwright, were similar to those of the English *Familists* or *Family of Love*; but it is less clear whether or not they were really *Antinomians*.[16] Their insistence, however, that not *Works*, but *Christ* in the heart and life is the real sign of sanctification, did leave a "perillous door" opened for the neglect of the outward forms of godliness.

Expelled to "Aquiday" or the island of Rhode Island, it was said that Mrs. Hutchinson and her followers

> ". . . broached new heresies every year. Divers of them turned professed Anabaptists, and would not wear arms, and denied all magistracy among Christians, and maintained that there were no churches since those founded by the apostles and evangelists, nor could any be, nor any pastors ordained, nor seals administered but by such, and that the church was to want these all the time she continued in the wilderness, as she yet was." [17]

This position was essentially that of the *Seekers*, and it would appear that Roger Williams, who had already founded the Providence Plantations in protest against the religious intolerance of the Bay Colony, was of the same way of think-

[14] A complete account of the trial, containing all the relevant documents is to be found in Adams, Antinomianism. Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay, L. S. Mayo ed. (Cambridge, 1936), II, 366–391, contains the record of the Examination of Mrs. Hutchinson by the General Court. Winthrop, Journal, I, 195 ff. contains much first hand information. For a brief, popular treatment see, Edith Curtis, Anne Hutchinson, A Biography (Cambridge, 1930).

[15] A Short Story of the Rise, Reign and Ruine of the Antinomians, etc. (London, 1644), usually ascribed to Thomas Wilde, but probably written by Winthrop, is printed in Adams, op. cit., 67–233. Another edition entitled, Antinomians and Familists Condemned by the Synod of Elders in New England, etc. (London, 1644), is among the rare books in Harvard College Library.

[16] C. F. Bell, John Wheelwright, His Writings, etc. (Boston, 1876), 153 ff. In his famous Fast Day Sermon, 1636, Wheelwright actually warned his hearers to live pure and blameless lives, and "to give not occasion to others to say we are libertines or Antinomians." Ibid., 175.

[17] Winthrop, Journal, II, 39.

ıg.[18] Rhode Island thus became a hot-bed of religious dissent. eventeenth century writers spoke of it with dread, as the *Iland f Errors*.[19] "I believe," wrote Cotton Mather at the close of he century,

there never was held such a variety of *religions* together on so small a spot f ground as have been in that colony. It has been a *colluvies* of Antinomian- sm, Familists, Anabaptists, Anti-Sabbatarians, Arminians, Socianians, Quakers, Ranters, everything in the world but Roman Catholics, and *real* Christians, . . . so that, if a man had lost his religion, he might find it at the eneral muster of opinionists!" [20]

Written history is bound to be fragmentary. The great mass of human experience and belief must always remain unwritten. No one will ever know, therefore, how many persons in seventeenth century New England shared the strange ideas of the 'opinionists," nor how many of their attitudes were passed on to succeeding generations. Certainly, it is most unlikely that the Baptists and the Quakers were the only direct heirs of the *enthusiasts*. The later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, however, were not propitious times for the growth of such ideas.

The Age of Reason

"It was the special function of the eighteenth century to diffuse common-sense and reasonableness in life and thought, to civilize manners and to humanize conduct." [21] Men shivered at the thought of those "late unhappy times when Hell broke loose." Few even uttered the word "enthusiasm," without "a start of alarm." [22] When, near the beginning of the century,

[18] Cotton Mather, Magnalia, II, 498, says that Williams advised his followers, "to *forgo* all, to *dislike* everything, and wait for the coming of new apostles; whereupon they dissolved themselves, and became that sort of a sect which we term *Seekers*, keeping to that one principle, 'that everyone should have the liberty to worship God according to the light of his own conscience,' but owning of no true *churches* or ordinances now in the world." In The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience, etc. S. L. Caldwell ed. (Pub. of Narragansett Club, Providence 1867), First Series, III, 70. Roger Williams accused the Puritan churches of worshipping God, "in sleepy ignorance."

[19] Adams, Antinomianism, 93.

[20] Mather, Magnalia, II, 520.

[21] G. M. Trevelyan, A History of England (New York, 1926), 514.

[22] C. J. Abbey, The English Church and Its Bishops, 1700–1800 (London, 1887), II, 79.

some of the persecuted French *Camisards* sought refuge in Eng land, their claims to direct inspiration were met by a flood o protests,

"that any Bold Enthusiastic Impositors should have the Confidence t vent such Doctrines, and practice such lewd and abominable Absurditi under pretence of the Worship of God, as are manifestly condemned by th Holy Scriptures, by the Publick Reason of the Church in all Ages, and b the Private Reason of all the World, but themselves." [23]

This change from the heated emotions of 1650 was partly natural psychological reaction. Men were weary of religiou and civil strife and of fanaticism in both Church and State It was also a direct result of the new "Physico-Mathematica Experimental Learning." [24] Men's minds were fascinated b the idea of the harmonious orderliness of the Newtonian un verse. The long search for authority seemed at last to hav ended. The title of John Locke's treatise, The Reasonablene of Christianity, sums up the theology of the period.[25] Durin the first half of the century Deists like Tindal and Clarke en deavored to show that the Bible is not contrary to reason. Th pulpit of the second half is best described in the words o Samuel Johnson, as "the old Bailey of theology, in which th Apostles are being tried once a week for the capital crime o forgery." [26] Probably, Bishop Gibson's fourth Pastoral Letter entitled, "By Way of Caution against Lukewarmness on th one Hand, and Enthusiasm on the Other. . . . Both Mistake being greatly Prejudicial to Religion, and Dangerous to th Souls of Men," [27] sums up the current attitude of the clergy while the Earl of Shaftsbury's calm assumption that, "Goo humour is not only the best security against enthusiasm, bu the best foundation of piety and true religion," [28] indicates hov

[23] R. Kingston, Enthusiastick Impositors No Divinely Inspir'd Prophets (Londo 1707), Dedication.

[24] Cf., J. H. Randall, The Making of the Modern Mind (New York, 1926), Ch. XI

[25] John Locke, The Reasonableness of Christianity (London, 1695).

[26] Quoted in Mark Pattison, "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688 1750," Essays (Oxford, 1889), II, 49.

[27] Edmund Gibson, Five Pastoral Letters (London, 1760), 244–245.

[28] Anthony, Earl of Shaftsbury, "A Letter Concerning Enthusiasm" (1707) Characteristics of Men, Manners and Opinions, J. M. Robertson ed. (New York, 1900) I, 17.

great was the change that had taken place since the days of the Commonwealth.

The Puritan Decline

Deism does not appear to have exerted any significant influence in New England until after 1776.[29] Nevertheless, a very slight acquaintance with colonial literature is sufficient to make one aware that the Puritan state did not escape the secularizing tendencies of the age.

As early as 1679 the General Court of Massachusetts summoned a Synod to consider grave questions concerning the commonweal. (1) What are the Evils that have provoked the Lord to bring his Judgements on New England? (2) What is to be done that so those Evils may be Removed? [30] In reply, the Synod prepared a list of thirteen "visible and manifest Evils," which they agreed were "the ground and bottom of the Lord's Controversy with his People." They discovered,

'. . . A great and visible decay of the power of Godliness amongst many Professors in these churches . . . spiritual and heart Apostacy from God . . . whereby men cease to know and fear and love and trust in him; but take up their contentment and satisfaction in something else. . . . The Pride that doth abound in New England testifies against us. . . . A refusing to be subject to Order according to divine appointment . . . Contention . . . Pride in respect to Apparel . . . Church Fellowship and other divine Institutions are greatly neglected. . . . There are too many that with profane Esau slight spiritual priveleges . . . Humane Inventions, and Will Worship have been set up even in Jerusalem. . . . There is great profaneness, in respect of irreverent behaviour in the solemn Worship of God. . . . It is a frequent thing for men to give way to their own sloth and sleepiness, when they should be serving God with attention and intention. . . . There is much Sabbath-breaking; Since there are multitudes that do profanely absent themselves or theirs from the publick Worship of God, on His Holy Day. . . . As to what concerns Familyes and the Government thereof, there is much amiss. . . . In this respect Christians in this Land have become too like unto the Indians. . . . Most of the Evils that abound amongst us, proceed from defects as to Family Government. . . . Inordinate Passions. Sinful Heats and Hatreds. . . . Much Intemperance. . . . Hainous breaches of the seventh Commandment. . . . Immodest apparel. . . . Promise-breaking. . . . Religion is made sub-

[29] "Up to 1776 deism was still an aristocratic cult confined to a few intellectuals residing in relatively large towns." H. M. Morais, Deism in America (New York, 1934), 17.

[30] Williston Walker, The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism (New York, 1893), 423.

servient unto worldly Interests. . . . Men are under the prevailing power o a worldly spirit. . . . There hath been Opposition unto the work of Reforma tion. . . . A Publick Spirit is greatly wanting in most of men. . . . Thoug the Gospel and Covenant of Grace call upon men to repent, yet there ar multitudes that refuse to Repent, when the Lord doth vouchsafe them tru means." [31]

This dismal picture can be duplicated from the sermons o the time.[32] The Results of the Synod of 1679 did not halt th decline, and forty and fifty years afterwards in Fast Day an Election Sermons New England ministers repeated its words a they bewailed the continued back-sliding of God's people. Th titles alone of some of these discourses are sufficient to show th trend. For example, in 1687 James Allen of Boston preache on, Neglect of Supporting and Maintaining the Pure Worshi of God, by the Professing People of God; is a God-provokin and Land-wasting Sin. Seven years later Reverend Samu Willard preached on, Reformation the Great Duty of an Aff licted People, Setting Forth the Sin and Danger there is i Neglecting of it, under the Continued and Repeated Judg ments of God.[33] In 1720, Stephen Hosmer preached before th General Court of Connecticut on, A People's Living in Ap pearance and Dying in Reality.[34]

The only concrete suggestions the Reforming Synod ha been able to make were that the Colonial Laws relating to pr fanity, heresy, family discipline and taverns "be duely con sidered," and impartially enforced, and that "Solemn an explicit Renewal of the Covenant" be encouraged in th churches.[35] This latter practice was a direct outcome of th famous Half-Way Covenant, which was itself a landmark i the decay of the "New England Way."

As the children of the founders had come of age it was dis

[31] Walker, op. cit., 427 ff.

[32] Cf., P. G. E. Miller, "Declension in a Bible Commonwealth." (Reprinted fron the Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, 1942); G. L. Walker Some Aspects of the Religious Life of New England (Boston, 1897), esp. ch. II, "The Puritan Decline."

[33] W. D. Love, The Fast and Thanksgiving Days of New England (Boston, 1895) 519, 520.

[34] G. L. Walker, op. cit., 74.

[35] W. Walker, Creeds and Platforms, 435–436.

covered that they had not experienced that inner working of God in the soul, which according to Puritan theory must precede admission into the visible church.[36] They, therefore, remained outside the fold. With a third generation, the problem became even more acute, for the church was becoming a minority in the towns. At a Synod held in Boston in 1662, it was decided, that since the covenant promises included children, by "owning the covenant," that is, acknowledging their relationship to the God of their fathers, any baptised person whose life was not openly scandalous could present a child for baptism. They were not, however, to be admitted to the Lord's Table, or to be granted full church membership. For these privileges, the old evidences of an inward work of grace were still required, and such a work could come from God alone. Man could only fulfil the duties of a good parent and citizen, and wait for the Holy Ghost.[37]

The result of the Half-Way Covenant was not only that there came to be two rolls of church members, one regenerate and in full communion, the other unregenerate and half-way, but also, as time passed, a most un-Puritanical trend towards formalism and dependence upon outward "means." If conversion was solely a work of God, it was argued, might he not have conditioned his gifts upon the diligent use of the means of grace? The form of owning the covenant, the practice of regular prayer, Bible-study and church attendance, and outward respectability became the main substance of religion. By 1677 Reverend Solomon Stoddard of Northampton, Massachusetts, had abolished the two rolls altogether, and had received all baptised persons, irrespective of their inward state, at the Lord's Table.[38]

[36] "A personall and publick *confession* and declaring of God's manner of working upon the soul, is both lawful, expedient and useful." The Cambridge Platform, XII, 5, Ibid., 223.

[37] For a full discussion of the Half-Way Covenant, together with the full text of the Results of the Synod of 1662, see W. Walker, Creeds and Platforms, 239–339. P. G. E. Miller, "The Half-Way Covenant," New England Quarterly (1933), VI, 676–715, contains an analysis of the religious situation.

[38] P. G. E. Miller, "Solomon Stoddard, 1643–1729," Harvard Theological Review (Oct., 1941), XXXIV, 297, is an excellent short review of the breakdown of the Half-Way Covenant.

While many of the New England churches refused to follow Stoddard in this departure from the "Order of the Gospel," they did not escape the general trend towards moralism. More and more, the custom of "owning the covenant," "consenting to the covenant of grace," "renewing the covenant," was substituted in the churches for any vital religious experience. By such outward and public acts of commitment, it was felt,

"... Men are brought under a stronger obligation, unto better obedience. There is an Awe of God upon the Consciences of men when so obliged. As it is in respect of Oaths, they that have any Conscience in them, when under such Bonds, are afraid to violate them. Some that are but Legalists and Hypocrites, yet solemn Covenants with God, have such an Awe upon Conscience, as to enforce them into an outward Reformation, and that doth divert temporal Judgements. And they that are sincere, will thereby be engaged unto a more close and holy walking before the Lord, and so become more eminently blessings unto the Societyes and places whereto they do belong." [39]

The form of covenant used varied in different churches. In the First Church of Cambridge, it consisted of an acknowledgement of the God of their fathers, and of their sin, together with a renunciation of "The vanities of this evil world," and an undertaking "to walk in the way," and to maintain in their lives "a continued sense of obligation . . . to be the Lord's." [40] In Magnalia, Cotton Mather gives another form which was undoubtedly used in his father's church, The Second Church of Boston. In it there are three promises, to reform heart and life and discharge all covenant duties, to uphold family worship, catechising and exhorting the children, and to endeavor to be pure from the "sins of the time." [41]

Such renewals were only made after times of solemn prayer and fasting. Assent was expressed "by the brethren lifting up their hands, and by the women only standing up." [42] The minister, usually assisted by neighboring pastors, did not miss the opportunity of driving home "the covenant obligations." Here and there, under the impulse of "awe and fear," religious

[39] Result of Synod, 1679, W. Walker, op. cit., 436.

[40] Records of the Church of Christ at Cambridge in New England, S. P. Sharples ed. (Boston, 1906), 80.

[41] Mather, Magnalia, II, 333.

[42] Ibid., II, 332.

revivals actually did occur,[43] but on the whole, New England Puritanism by the beginning of the eighteenth century had become stereotyped and dead. "Indeed," cried Reverend Samuel Whitman of Farmington, in the Election Sermon before the General Court of Connecticut in 1714,

> "'tis too Evident to be denied, that Religion is on the Wane among us, 'T is Languishing in all Parts of the Land. . . . Is not Religion degenerated into an empty Form? . . . We are risen up a Generation that have in a great Measure forgot the Errand of our Fathers." [44]

Actually, the grandsons of the Puritans had other matters to occupy their minds. For thirty-eight years, from the outbreak of King Philip's War in 1675 to the Peace of Utrecht in 1713, the colonists were engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the Indians and the French. Farm houses were burned, women and children were carried off by the savages, there were midnight alarms and massacres. Governor Hutchinson estimated that "five or six thousand of the youth of the country had perished by the enemy, or by distemper contracted in the service during that time." [45] In one town, two-thirds of the men of military age were engaged in Phips's expedition against Quebec.[46]

With the final coming of peace there was a marked movement of expansion. Settlers swarmed into western Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Maine. In the thirty years between 1680 and 1710 only twenty-five new Congregational Churches had been gathered in Massachusetts. Between 1710 and 1740 there were one hundred and eighteen.[47]

The new frontier, however, created its own problems. Amid the crash of falling trees, and the raising of barns, it was not easy to remember that these things were not "the chief end of

[43] There were revivals at East Windsor, Conn., in 1694; at Taunton, Mass., in 1704; at Northampton, Mass., in 1712, and 1718; and at Windham, Conn., in 1721, G. L. Walker, Some Aspects, 83–84; M. H. Mitchell, "The Great Awakening in Connecticut," Tercentenary Commission of the State of Connecticut, Committee of Historical Publications (New Haven, 1934), 17.

[44] Quoted in G. L. Walker, op. cit., 73. [45] Hutchinson, History, II, 150.

[46] Francis Parkman, Frontenac and New France Under Louis XIV, Frontenac edition (New York, 1915), VIII, 257.

[47] J. S. Clark, A Historical Sketch of the Congregational Churches in Massachusetts, 1620–1858 (Boston, 1858), 94–199.

man." The danger, the isolation, the freedom from restraint and the opportunities for success bred self reliance and a spirit of independence which did not fit in with the code of the standing order. Ministers complained that many of their church members were "going above their Estates and Degrees," not merely in the matter of ignoring the proper and prescribed form of dress for their particular class, but also, "in a contempt of those that are by far their Betters: the Child behaving himself Proudly against the Ancient, the Base against the Honourable." [48] Every Election and Fast Day Sermon was made an occasion for a lament over these departures from the old way. To the frontiersman, they only served to strengthen the conviction that he had little in common with the clergy, and to foster the spirit of resentment and defiance which was already present. The whole teaching of Calvinistic theology began to be doubted and questioned, not because of the influence of deism and of the Age of Reason, but because of the practical social situation on the frontier. "The ideals of the frontier are equality, freedom of opportunity, unrestrained liberty of exploitation, individual success, faith in the common man." [49] Such distinctions as "elect" and "reprobate" were incompatible with the tempers of self-made men. The growing emphasis on "means" and "works," which developed after the Reforming Synod, reflect this same tendency. A generation which had tested its strength against naked Iroquois and Abenakis, and which was conquering the wilderness with axe and wedge, did not hesitate to take out of the hands of the Almighty also, the solemn business of justification. Theologically this attitude came to be known as Arminianism,[50] but it was largely an indigenous growth, the expression of the demand of a hard-working, heavy-drinking and self-reliant people for a religion more adapted to their lives.

[48] Quoted in G. L. Walker, op. cit., 73.

[49] J. T. Adams, Revolutionary New England, 1691–1776 (Boston, 1923), 9.

[50] It is apparent that this so called *Arminianism* had little to do with the theology of the Dutch scholar Arminius or the contemporary Arminianism of the Wesleys. For a brief treatment of the subject see, F. A. Christie, "The Beginnings of Arminianism in New England," Papers of the American Society of Church History, 2nd series (New York, 1912), III, 153–172.

There is one other social factor which enters into the religious situation in this period, that is, the class struggle which developed in New England as a result of the financial depression which followed the long years of war. In order to finance the various colonial expeditions the governments had resorted to the practice of issuing paper money. By 1714, in Massachusetts alone there was £240,000 in paper currency in circulation, and silver had almost disappeared from the province.[51] New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Connecticut were also deeply in debt. Inflation naturally led to a rise in prices and a higher cost of living. This was coupled with the expansion of the frontier and the demand for more money. Debtors and promoters urged new issues of paper. The whole country was divided on the subject into bitterly hostile parties. On the one side were the governing and commercial groups, who were the creditors, and who were, for the most part, the conservative class of the older settlements. On the other side were the debtors, the lower classes of the sea-board and the newer men of the frontier towns. The struggle between these two groups continued throughout the first four decades of the eighteenth century, creating ill-will, bitterness and resentment. Old antagonisms between the landowning or proprietor class and the less fortunate artisans, laborers and small farmers, burst into flame. By 1740 New England was on the verge of a social revolution. The climax was reached when five thousand supporters of the "Land Bank," that is an issue of paper money based on land securities, were reported to be preparing to march upon Boston to secure their rights.[52] The catastrophe was avoided, but the strong feelings then aroused, continued, and found expression in both political and ecclesiastical affairs. In the former, it made for revolution and freedom from the dominance of the English Parliament; in the latter, it led to a revolt against the

[51] A. M. Davis, Colonial Currency Reprints (Prince Society, Boston 1910), I, 34.

[52] Some accounts state that 20,000 men were preparing to march on Boston and to throw the merchants' stock of corn into the Bay. For the whole subject of the Land Bank see A. M. Davis, Currency and Banking in Massachusetts Bay (New York, 1900), II, 153 ff. Valuable lists of names are included in these papers.

power and privilege of the Congregational Churches and Clergy,[53] and to a re-emergence of *enthusiasm*.

The Great Awakening

In September 1740, New England was visited for the first time by the noted English revivalist, Reverend George Whitefield.[54] The land was ripe for his message. The way had been prepared by glowing accounts of his triumphs in Philadelphia and New York.[55] Revivals at Northampton in 1734 and 1735, under the ministry of Reverend Jonathan Edwards, and widely publicized by his Narrative of Surprising Conversions (1736), had also stimulated the popular imagination to a state of expectancy. In fact all the current trends of the century, the moral decline, the increased reliance upon external forms of religion, the toughening individualism and the democratic ideals of the common man prepared the way for an "awakening."

In Boston, the churches could not contain the crowds who thronged to hear the young preacher. Outdoor meetings were resorted to, and fifteen and twenty thousand persons assembled on Boston Common. Scenes reminiscent of Blackheath and the early field-preaching in England and Wales were repeated. "The power and presence of the Lord" descended. "Many now wept exceedingly and cried out under the word." Great numbers followed the preacher to his lodgings, where he again addressed them and met personally with inquirers. Sometimes, the multitude was so deeply impressed and affected by his prayers that he was obliged to cease because of the loud outcries of convicted sinners.[56]

[53] For brief discussion see, J. C. Miller, "Religion, Finance and Democracy in Massachusetts," New England Quarterly (1933), VI, 29–58.

[54] George Whitefield (1714–1770), friend of the Wesleys, visited America six times, preaching with remarkable results from Georgia to Maine. For biography see, L. Tyerman, The Life of the Rev. George Whitefield (London, 1876).

[55] Cf., C. H. Maxson, The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies (Chicago, 1920), 41 ff.

[56] George Whitefield, A Continuation of . . . Journal (London, 1741), 26–41. This is the so-called Seventh Journal which caused such offence in New England that the author later revised it. It contains some very sharp criticisms of New England religion and of Harvard College.

Although Whitefield was a Calvinist, and won the approval of some of the older New England ministers by declaring that man was "half a devil and half a beast," yet his preaching, on the whole, emphasized rather the gracious side of the Divine nature. He was very conscious of his own "baseness," and, like so many of the enthusiasts, was at times morbidly introspective, yet as he says, "Since Jesus Christ had shown such mercy to me, and did not withdraw his Holy Spirit from me, the chief of sinners, I was enabled the more feelingly to talk of his love." [57] Undoubtedly, it was his personal emphasis upon the grace and love of God which overwhelmed audiences who were accustomed only to hear dull reasonings concerning God's justice. Preaching at York, Maine on October 2, 1740, he records, "I could speak little or no Terror, but almost all Consolation. . . . The Hearers looked plain and simple; and the Tears trickled apace down most of their Cheeks." [58] Add to this tender Gospel, a personality and a manner of presentation unequalled in his century, and it is little wonder that congregations were "melted," and that persons of all ages had an experience of religion such as they had never dreamed possible before.

Between September 14, 1740, when he landed at Newport, and October 28, when he crossed into the Province of New York, Whitefield visited some twenty New England towns, "preached one hundred and seventy-five times in public, besides exhorting frequently in private," [59] and held interviews with hundreds of inquirers. Throughout the land he left an earnest body of "awakened" Christians, both ministers and laymen. These carried on the revival in their own parishes. At Natick, Wrentham, Bridgewater, Plymouth, Sutton, Taunton, Middleborough, Halifax, Portsmouth, Gloucester, Reading, Newcastle, Westerly, Northampton, Lyme, Enfield and other places, there were remarkable conversions and unprecedented experiences of religious fervor.[60] Accounts of these

[57] Ibid., 29.
[58] Ibid., 34.
[59] Clark, Historical Sketch, 166.
[60] Cf. Tracy, The Great Awakening, 120–213.

were collected and published by Reverend Thomas Prince, Jr., in The Christian History, the first religious weekly in America, and these served to spread the fame of the revival.[61] There was no doubt that New England religious life had undergone a remarkable transformation. The churches seemed to be returning once more to the early practice of the fathers of demanding a conscious religious experience of their members. The Half-Way Covenant appeared about to be swept away, and the churches restored to the status of holy communities of regenerate saints. "Conviction" or a vivid realization of personal sin and vileness, followed by "conversion" or an equally vivid realization of God's mercy and favor, the one accompanied by the utmost depression and fear, and the other by unrestrained joy and exaltation of spirit, became the accepted prerequisites of a Christian. All else, and especially every human effort such as reasoning and education, was secondary to this. Preaching took on more life and vigor. For half a century ministers had been tied to their manuscripts and notes, now there came a great release of extemporaneous effort. No doubt it was less polished and learned, but it had the virtue of being personal and alive. Everywhere there sprang up a body of converted laymen, who shared the concern of their ministers for winning souls, and worked with them toward that end. This, more than any other single feature was the significant result of the Great Awakening. It was the recognition of individualism and democracy in religion, a new attempt of the common man to take his place in the "universal priesthood of all believers."

The revival, however, was not all harmony and blessedness. Because of his strong belief in conversion, Whitefield had not hesitated to attack "unconverted ministers," in a public lecture in the Old South Church in Boston.

"I am verily persuaded the generality of preachers talk of an unknown and unfelt Christ; and the reason why congregations have been so dead is, because they have dead men preaching to them. O that the Lord may quicken and revive them, for his own name's sake. For how can dead men beget living children?" [62]

[61] The Christian History, Containing Accounts of the Revival and Propagation of Religion in Great Britain, America, etc., 2vv. (Boston, 1743–44).

[62] Whitefield, Seventh Journal, 38.

Two weeks after Mr. Whitefield left New England, he sent Reverend Gilbert Tennent, in whose parish of New Brunswick, New Jersey, a spectacular awakening had already taken place, to follow up his mission.[63] Tennent was a much coarser preacher than Whitefield. As one of his hearers wrote, "He appeared . . . like a *Boatswain* of a Ship, calling the Sailors to *come* to *Prayers and be damned*." [64] Even a warm friend of the revival like Reverend Thomas Prince of Boston described his preaching as "terrible," as he —

> "exhibited the dreadful holiness, justice, law, threatenings, truth, power, majesty of God, and his anger with rebellious, impenitent, unbelieving and Christless sinners; the awful danger they were under every moment in being struck down to hell, and being damned forever; with the amazing miseries of that place of torment." [65]

For the unconverted ministry, this stern revivalist had nothing but unmitigated scorn. In one sermon he called them,

> "Hirelings, Catterpillars, Letter-learned Pharisees, Men that have the Craft of Foxes and the Cruelty of Wolves, plaistered Hypocrites, Varlets, the Seed of the Serpent . . . dead Dogs that cannot bark . . . Daubers with untempered Mortar, Moral Negroes . . . Swarms of Locusts . . . Dead Drones." [66]

"He seemed," wrote a contemporary, "to have a particular Quarrel with Reason, Learning and Morality, for he seldom finished a Sermon, without saying something against them." [67]

The result was that a spirit of censoriousness and criticism was introduced into the revival. New converts, exulting in the singular tokens of the Lord's favor which they had so recently experienced, looked with contempt upon the caution and conservatism of their ministers. Especially, as the lines of religious division became crossed with those of the social and economic struggle, tempers became more and more inflamed.

[63] Maxson, op. cit., 21ff.

[64] A Letter from a Gentleman in Boston to Mr. George Wishart . . . Concerning the State of Religion in New England (Edinburgh, 1742), 4.

[65] P. G. Mode, Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History (Menasha, Wis., 1921), 219.

[66] Charles Chauncy, Seasonable Thoughts on the State of Religion in New England (Boston, 1743), 249.

[67] The State of Religion in New England Since the Rev. Mr. George Whitefield's Arrival There, in a Letter from a Gentleman in New England to his Friend in Glasgow, etc. (signed A. M.), (Glasgow, 1742), 3.

Rival meetings or conventicles were set up in some places, and the old minister was left to preach —

" . . . almost to the bare Walls, whilst an ignorant and impudent Fellow, that perhaps has been remarkable for his former Villanies, and is liable to be cast into Prison by twenty Creditors, is mouthing it to Multitudes in the Neighboring Fields." [68]

Under such leadership the revival began to be marred, in many places, by emotional extravagances which shocked and alienated the more sober thinking part of the community. Meetings were prolonged until midnight, while local or visiting enthusiasts exhorted the people. Sometimes, several would be talking or screaming at once, then, by the flickering light of a few candles, the solemn Meeting-House would be shaken by groans, outcries, convulsive twitchings and stamping.[69] One peculiar characteristic mentioned by many contemporaries, was "loud hearty laughing." "If a Number of converted meet together, they break out into a Laugh, that surprizes every one, not infected with their Distemper." [70] Epileptic fits, accompanied by visions and trances were also common. "When they come out of their Trances, they commonly tell a senseless Story of Heaven and Hell, and whom and what they saw there." [71]

The climax of these wild extravagances was reached with the fanatical preaching of an itinerant minister, Reverend James Davenport of Southold, Long Island. Dr. Chauncy of Boston has preserved the following account of his excesses.

". . . At length he turned his discourse to others and with the utmost strength of his lungs, addressed himself to the congregation, under these and such like expressions — 'You poor, unconverted Creatures, in the Seats, in the Pews,

[68] Ibid., 10.

[69] "Sometimes many more would scream and cry out, or send forth the most *lamentable Groans, . . . clapping their Hands*, uttering *exstatick Expressions*, . . . some would swoon away . . . others labored under convulsive Twitches of Body." — A Letter to Mr. George Wishart, 16.

[70] The State of Religion, 8. Cf., also Chauncy, op. cit., 240.

[71] The State of Religion, 7. See also the remarkable account of a vision seen by two children, 11 and 13 years old, who disturbed the whole town of Lebanon, Conn., by claiming to have seen the Book of Life, and the names of their friends and neighbors written therein, related in Rev. Solomon Williams, The More Excellent Way (New London, 1742), Prefatory Letter.

n the Galleries, I wonder you don't drop into Hell! It would not surprize me, should not wonder at it, if I should see you drop down now, this minute into Hell. You Pharisees, Hypocrites, now, now, now, you are going to the Bottom of Hell. I wonder you don't drop by Scores and Hundreds.' . . . Then he came out of the Pulpit and stripped off his upper Garments and got into the Seats, and leapt up and down some time and clapt his hands and cried out in those words. 'The War goes on, the Fight goes on, the Devil goes down;' and then betook himself to stamping and screaming most dreadfully." [72]

Little wonder, that under such powerful emotional assault, there were "swoonings away and falling to the Ground . . . bitter Shrieking and Screamings; Convulsion-like Trembling and Agitations, Strugglings and Tumblings." When these excesses were accompanied by specific incitements to social revelism, and separation from the standing churches, there was an immediate response. Soon the pent up resentment and class feeling of both the creditor and debtor groups burst forth. Opposition to the revival, previously scattered and hesitant became united and bitter in its denunciations. Soon the churches were divided into two great factions, the *New Lights* or friends of the revival, and the *Old Lights* who opposed it. Two contemporary documents bear witness of the conflicting views of these two schools of thought. "The Testimony of the Pastors of the Churches in the Province of Massachusetts Bay, in New England, at their Annual Convention in Boston, May 25, 1743, against several Errors in Doctrine, and Disorders in Practice, which have late obtained in various Parts of the Land;" was signed by the Moderator of the Convention in behalf of the thirty-eight ministers present.[73]

A few weeks later the friends of the revival met and issued, "The Testimony and Advice of An Assembly of Pastors at a Meeting in Boston, July 7, 1743, occasioned by the late happy Revival of Religion in many Parts of the Land." It was signed by sixty-eight ministers, and accompanied by attestations from forty-five more, so it is evident how far reaching had been the influence of the Awakening.[74]

[72] Chauncy, Seasonable Thoughts, 98.

[73] Mode, Source Book, 222.

[74] Tracy, The Great Awakening, 295. See also, The Testimony of a Number of New England Ministers Met at Boston, Sept. 25, 1745, etc. (Boston, 1745), signed by twenty-four ministers, in an attempt to bring about peace between the two parties.

Both these "Testimonies" warned their readers of the dangers of following mere impulses and of disturbing "the gospel order of the churches," by encouraging itinerancy and separation. The real point at issue, however, was, were the abnormal physical manifestations, which accompanied the revival, to be accepted as sure marks and evidences of the presence of the Holy Ghost? Dr. Charles Chauncy in The Wonderful Narrative: Or Faithful Account of the French Prophets, Their Agitations, Extasies, and Inspirations, sought to discredit the revival by showing the similarity between its excesses and those of the deluded Camisards. He quoted with approval Calamy's Caveat Against New Prophets.

"If we dont learn to be afraid of anything that borders upon Enthusiasm either in ourselves or others, we show that we are not to be instructed by the Experience of other men, but are of the number of those, that can only be taught by feeling the Danger of making Divisions in Religion and of taking the Spirit of Errors and Delusion for the Spirit of Truth and Soberness." [75]

He was answered by Reverend Jonathan Edwards of Northampton, in Thoughts on the Revival of Religion, in which many of the abuses of the New Lights are acknowledged, but nevertheless, the good that had been accomplished is held up as proof that the work must be from God.[76]

These treatises were followed by many others, but the controversy soon passed beyond the stage of mere theological debate. In Connecticut, at the opening of the General Court, on May 13, 1742, Reverend Isaac Stiles of North Haven, "turned the artillery of heaven in a tremendous manner," upon the New Lights, urging his hearers to pray that, "God would continually keep up the Wall and Hedge about his Vineyard, and not suffer the Boar out of the Wood to waste it, nor the Wild Beasts of the Field to devour it." [77] He called upon the legislators to

[75] Charles Chauncy, The Wonderful Narrative: Or a Faithful Account of the French Prophets, Their Agitations, Extasies, and Inspirations to which are added Several Other Remarkable Instances of Persons under the Influence of the like Spirit, in various Parts of the World, particularly in New England: In a Letter to a Friend (Glasgow, 1742), 89.

[76] Jonathan Edwards, Works (Reprint of Worcester edition, New York, 1844), III

[77] Isaac Stiles, A Prospect of the City of Jerusalem in its Spiritual Beauty and Glory (London, 1742), 25, 46.

put a Stop to and prevent unscriptural Separations and Disorderly Practices."

A few days later, the Court passed the famous Act for reguting Abuses and correcting Disorders in Ecclesiastical Afairs,[78] which made it a penal offence for any layman to preach ithout a license, or any minister to conduct a meeting in anther parish without the consent of the minister or church of nat place. This procedure was possible in Connecticut because, y an act of the year 1708, the Congregational Churches of the rovince had been established according to the agreements of he Saybrook Platform,[79] which provided that all cases of displine which could not be settled within the local churches hould be referred to a "Consociation" or standing council of hurches, similar to a Presbytery. With these Consociations lso lay the right to ordain. A provision was made for those who soberly differ or dissent from the united churches hereby stablished," to worship in their own way.[80]

There can be no doubt that, as Benjamin Trumbull, the Connecticut historian says, the Ecclesiastical Law of 1742 was partial, inconsistent, and highly persecuting." [81] It was the work of a determined party within both church and government to preserve their own privileges. Justices of the peace nd other civil officials who favored the New Light doctrines were dismissed, and staunch supporters of the established order ut in their places. There was a concerted attempt to cast all the public odium and reproach possible" upon the revival.[82] James Davenport, who was preaching in the province at the ime that the act was passed, and who had denounced it as a nigh-handed infringement of the rights of conscience, and had rged his hearers to defy it, was ordered to be deported as a disturber of the peace, and as one "under the influence of en-

[78] Colonial Records of Connecticut, C. J. Hoadly and J. Trumbull eds. (Hartford, 1850–90), VIII, 454 ff.

[79] W. Walker, Creeds and Platforms, 495–523; M. L. Greene, The Development of Religious Liberty in Connecticut (Boston, 1905), ch. IV.

[80] W. Walker, op. cit., 507; Conn. Col. Rec., V, 87.

[81] Benjamin Trumbull, A Complete History of Connecticut to the Year 1764 (New Haven, 1818), II, 166.

[82] Ibid., 165.

thusiastical impressions and impulses, and thereby disturbe in the rational faculties of his mind." [83]

It was in this tense situation that the *Separate* or *Stric Congregationalist* Churches had their origin.[84]

The Separates

There were many friends of the revival, or New Lights within the churches of Connecticut who were supporters of th constitutional establishment of the churches, and who as earn est and sober-minded Christians deplored the disorders agains which the Ecclesiastical Law of 1742 was aimed. On the othe hand, there were many who denied the right of the governmen to meddle in spiritual affairs, and claimed the privilege of organ izing their churches under the old Cambridge Platform o Congregationalism, rather than under the Saybrook Articles "They believed the whole system of parish administration a usurpation of power wholly opposed to Scripture, and that eac individual local church should call, settle and support its min ister, and manage all its spiritual and secular concerns." [85] T such persons, in the words of Solomon Paine, one of the staunch est of the New Light professors, "That law made for restrainin such preaching and exhorting was made by the Devil in th lowest pit of Hell," and they would "be burnt to ashes befor they would obey the Devil or any of his Crew." [86]

In May 1743, the General Assembly gave the screws anothe turn. It was "resolved that those commonly called Presby terians or Congregationalists should not take the benefit," of th Toleration Act of 1708, or as it was officially known, "the Ac for the Relief of Sober Consciences." [87] This meant, that whil

[83] Tracy, op. cit., 240.

[84] The Separates are treated briefly in Tracy, op. cit. Ch. XVII; G. L. Walker, op cit., 112–121; R. C. Learned, "Separate Churches in Connecticut," in Contribution to the Ecclesiastical History of Connecticut (New Haven, 1861), 253–259; S. L. Blake The Separates (Boston, 1902), is the most thorough treatment of the subject.

[85] E. D. Larned, History of Windham County (Worcester, 1874), I, 412. Thi history gives an excellent picture of the Separates in the county where they were mos numerous.

[86] Ibid., I, 433.

[87] Conn. Col. Rec., VIII, 522.

Baptist, Episcopal and Quaker organizations were still entitled to worship as they pleased, Congregationalists must attend and support the ministry of the constituted churches. Connecticut was now under a state establishment "as rigorous, exacting and unbending as that against which the Separatists of Scrooby protested." [88]

The more radical and zealous elements among the New Lights, therefore, found themselves on the horns of a grave dilemma. On the one hand, was their firm conviction that they should only receive the Word of God from the lips of a converted ministry, and that the State had no right to dictate in matters of conscience; on the other hand, was the law, forbidding them to listen to the exhorters in whom they believed, and compelling them to hear the standing minister, no matter what his spiritual state might be, and to contribute to his salary through the legal rates which were collected by the tax collector. It is not surprising that faced with such a choice, many refused to obey the law, and maintained their right to speak and pray as they chose. Free religious meetings and conferences were continued, and in them fierce denunciations of the government were mingled with the spiritual exhortations of the enthusiasts.[89] In a short time the spirit of Separatism had spread like wild-fire through the Province.

In many cases there were little more than unorganized, excitable groups of New Lights who soon disbanded; but in at least thirty places actual churches were organized and continued to function for a longer or shorter period of time. These were situated for the most part in Windham, and New London Counties.[90] Because of the very nature of their origin, the membership of these Separate Churches was largely drawn from the lower classes of society, which were already dissatisfied with the existing order.[91] Social unrest and religious enthusiasm joined hands. "Many lawless, turbulent and disorderly spirits

[88] Blake, op. cit., 34.

[89] E. D. Larned, Windham County, I, 400.

[90] Blake, op. cit., 139–196, lists some 27 churches; R. C. Learned, op. cit., 253 ff., lists thirty-two.

[91] Larned, Windham County, I, 474, passim; G. L. Walker, op. cit., 113.

were thus received into church-membership." [92] In the sin cerity and simplicity of their belief in direct inspiration and i freedom of expression, the more solid leaders of the Separate provided no fixed standard of discipline for their adherents Instead, every member was subject to the vagaries of his ow brethren's divine intuitions. The result was anarchy and con fusion. Scenes reminiscent of the wild fanaticism of the Ana baptists and Ranters were re-enacted, and many of the doctrine of the sectaries besides that of religious freedom were revived Apocalyptical expectations filled the air.[93] The sacraments an all outward forms and duties were declared to be mere "lega bondage." Even marriage seems to have been attacked an nullified in some cases.[94] It is probable that more than on earnest and devout Separatist was led to exclaim, as did Eliza beth Chandler of Woodstock,

"I would not write a line counter to ye work of God if I knew where was, but I have got so bewildered and sunk that I can't tell where the work o God is." [95]

To these internal troubles of the Separates were added th sore trials produced by the determination of both ecclesiastica and civil authorities to "blow out the New Light." Never i American history has there been such severe and relentles persecution for conscience sake. As far as possible, the right of citizenship were taken from them. They were denied seat in the General Assembly. Baptisms and marriages performe by their ordained ministers were declared illegal. Their at tempt to found a college to train their young men for the min istry was thwarted by an act of the General Court,[96] and thei sons who were studying at Yale College were in two cases ex pelled. Even the courts of law were deaf to their appeals fo justice. Because they denied the right of the state to tax them for the support of ministers of whom they did not approve, and refused to pay such dues, their property was confiscated and

[92] Larned, op. cit., I, 474.

[93] Cf., S. Williams, More Excellent Way, Preface.

[94] Larned, op. cit., I, 474–475.

[95] Ibid., I, 475.

[96] Conn. Col. Records, VIII, 501; Greene, op. cit., 255. The college, known as "th Shepherd's Tent," was in New London.

sold at auction. When goods failed, persons were seized and thrown into prison, where sometimes they found their exhorters and itinerant preachers already languishing. Miss Larned states that at Windham a new story had to be added to the county jail to accommodate the large number of Separates who were imprisoned there.[97] The following letter, dated May 13, 1752, exactly ten years after the passing of the obnoxious Ecclesiastical Law, and addressed to the General Assembly, gives a vivid picture of the situation.

"Whereas, we are rendered incapable upon account of sickness and imprisonment, of sending a petition, we take this opportunity of informing your Honours of the difficulties we have met with as to our outward man because we are constrained to observe and follow the dictates of our conscience, agreeable to the Word of God, in matters of religion, looking upon it to be God's prerogative to order the affairs of his own worship. We are of that number who soberly dissent from the Church established by Conn., and though we have no design to act in contempt of any lawful authority, or to disturb any religious society, but only to worship God according to the rules he had given us in his Word in that way now called Separation, yet have we suffered the loss of much of our goods, particularly because we could not in conscience pay minister's rates, it appearing to us very contrary to the way that the Lord hath ordained even the present way in which ministers are maintained — Poor men's estates taken away and sold for less than a quarter of their value, and no over-plus returned, as hath been the case of your Honour's poor informers; yea, poor men's cows taken away when they had but one for the support of their families, and the children crying for milk and could get none, because the collector had taken their cow for minister's rates. Neither have they stopped here, though we have never resisted them, but when our goods could no longer suffice we were taken from our families and cast into prison, where some of us have lain above two months, far distant from our families, who are in very difficult circumstances. Yea! and we must unavoidable lie the remainder of our days unless we consent to such methods for which we can see no warrant in God's Word. No! Surely it never came into his mind, neither has he commanded that it should be so, that the Gospel of peace should be so maintained: he hath told his ministers how they shall have their maintainance, but not a word of imprisoning men for refusing to maintain them, surely the best things corrupted form the worst. And now, we pray you to take notice of our difficulty, and grant us relief from bondage that we may enjoy the proveleges other dissenters enjoy." [98]

It is indicative of the temper of the times that the legislature was unmoved by this appeal, and the prisoners remained in

[97] Larned, op. cit., I, 458–459.

[98] Quoted in Larned, Windham County, I, 479.

Windham Jail. Such sentiments of human rights and liberty of conscience as they expressed, however, sank deep into the minds of common people throughout New England, and although they failed to win it for themselves, some of the credit for winning national and religious freedom must go to these humble and persecuted Separates.

Doctrinally, the New Light or Separate Churches were strictly Calvinist, adhering to the Trinitarian faith and the Westminster Confession. The movement was never marked by any theological innovations greater than a belief that a spiritual meaning lies hidden behind the letter of the Scriptures, "which no man can come to the knowledge of, but by the special revelation or opening of the spirit of God." [99] Their errors were, rather, in the realm of discipline and order. They were inclined, as has been already noted, to depend upon impulses and impressions, and to make religion consist in outcries, "in bodily agitations, in great fears and joys, in zeal and talk." [100] Therefore, they were convinced that if they did not *feel* a minister's preaching he must be unconverted and hence unfit to occupy a pulpit. They also chose their own pastors by the same intuitive method. It was an important part of their witness against the Saybrook Regulations that pastors should be ordained, not by a consociation, but by a local church. When Paul Park was ordained over the Separate Church at Preston, on July 15, 1747, "it was enjoined upon him, by no means to study or premeditate what he should say in public but to speak as the Spirit should give him utterance." [101]

As a result of this prejudice against human learning, Separatist utterances came to be clothed in a strange apocalyptic imagery, not unlike that used by the English sectaries of the Commonwealth period. On one occasion at least, works by such writers as Flavel, Henry, Increase Mather, Colman and Chauncy were consigned to the flames along with such trumpery as "Wigs, Cloaks . . . Hoods, Gowns, Rings, Jewels and Neck laces," and "a Pair of Plush Breeches," belonging to Reverend

[99] Trumbull, History of Connecticut, II, 193.
[100] Ibid., II, 169.
[101] Blake, The Separates, 106.

James Davenport.[102] The result of this policy was that the movement fell more and more into the hands of ignorant and fanatical men. "Dreams and visions supplied the place of dictionary and commentary." [103]

Probably, however, the most fatal error of the Separates was the assumption that they possessed "the Key of Knowledge," whereby they could distinguish a Christian from an unbeliever as certainly and as clearly "as a sheep may be known from a dog." [104] Only those with whom "they held communion in the inward actings of their own souls" were true believers. All others were hypocrites and the servants of Anti-Christ. This stimulated an attitude of suspicion and habitual fault-finding among the brethren, and it is to this, more than to any other single cause, that historians of the movement have attributed its decline. "Every man was at the mercy of the 'inward feelings' of his neighbor's soul." [105] As a result of this system of psychic espionage, the Separate Churches were torn by internal strife. One church had, within three years of its formation, suspended or cut off more than one-third of its membership on various charges.[106]

Another cause of disintegration was the spread of Baptist doctrines among the Separates. The two sects had much in common. Both believed in a pure church of regenerated members, in the exercise of spiritual gifts, and in a converted ministry. Both were opposed to a state church and compulsory rate-paying. The one essential point of difference was the question of the proper mode and subjects of baptism. For a time there was a considerable amount of coöperation and cordiality among them. Exhorters and itinerant preachers visited both groups, and Baptist ministers assisted at Separate ordi-

[102] Chauncy, Seasonable Thoughts, 221 ff. This remarkable piece of fanaticism occurred in New London in March 1743 under the leadership of James Davenport. The clothes and jewelry were not burned. See also Blake, op. cit., 101.

[103] Larned, Windham County, I, 469.

[104] Ibid., I, 469; Blake, op. cit., 205–206. For a contemporary account of the Separates see, A Letter from the Associated Ministers of the County of Windham, etc. (Boston, 1745).

[105] Larned, Windham County, I, 470.

[106] Ibid., I, 470. The church was at Canterbury, Conn.

nations.[107] The importance placed by that generation upon scriptural authority for every particular of church order, however, soon led to strife. Many Baptists were unwilling to commune with "unbaptized" persons. To the Separates this was elevating an outward form above the inner light of the spirit. Two councils were held in an attempt to reach some basis of agreement, and to unite the Baptist and Separate Churches in some kind of a fellowship. Twenty-seven churches were represented at the first council, held at Exeter, Rhode Island, May 23, 1753. Open communion was formally adopted and it was agreed, "That all the churches of this body are one church; that the words *dip* and *sprinkle* shall cease, and *baptize* be only used." [108] The local churches, however, refused to accept this agreement. The attempt at "mixed communion" led only to further controversy. On May 29, 1754, a second council was held at Stonington, Connecticut. Elders and messengers from twenty-four churches in Connecticut, eight in Massachusetts and seven in Rhode Island assembled "to hear the controversy between Baptists and Congregationalists," but union proved to be impossible.[109] Many Separates, convinced of the scriptural soundness of immersion, left their churches, other became Baptists in a body. The exemption from legal disabilities enjoyed by the Baptists was also a strong inducement to change. This gave rise to the accusation that the Separates "had themselves dipped to wash away their taxes." [110] Whatever the motive may have been, it is generally recognized that the Baptist denomination profited greatly by the "Great Schism" in Connecticut.[111]

[107] Ibid., I, 436; Tracy, The Great Awakening, 323; Blake, op. cit., 86.

[108] Larned, op. cit., I, 476.

[109] Isaac Backus, Church History of New England, from 1620–1804, etc. (Philadelphia, 1844), 177–178. The author was one of the Separate ministers who became a Baptist. He states that, "Though the communing of all real saints together appeared to be of great importance, yet many found by degrees that it could not be done in that way; for they saw that if they came to the Lord's supper with any who were only sprinkled in their infancy, it practically said they were baptised, when they believed in their consciences that they were not. And practical lying is a great sin."

[110] J. C. Meyer, Church and State in Massachusetts (Cleveland, 1930), 36.

[111] Cf., Blake, op. cit., 197; Greene, op. cit., 270, Backus, op. cit., 178. Williston Walker, A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States, The American Church History Series, III (New York, 1894), 263.

Fighting an unequal battle against the constituted authorities; torn asunder by internal strife and controversy; suffering from lack of trained leadership and from the ignorance and impulsiveness of its members, the Separate movement in Connecticut rapidly burned itself out. In 1756 a committee representing twenty churches carried an appeal to England, praying "for the benefit of the Toleration Act." [112] The result was a sharp letter of reprimand to the colonial authorities, from the chairman of the parliamentary committee for Dissenters, expressing amazement that "*Dissenters* from the *Church Establishment of Connecticut* should be denied the priveleges granted to those in *Great Britain*," and hinting that it might seriously affect the Colonial Charter. Although the persecuting laws were not repealed until after the Revolution, from 1756 on they ceased to be rigidly enforced. The relief, however, came too late to save the Separates. Disintegration had already gone too far. With "the moral camp-distemper" which accompanied the long French and Indian Wars, a new period of religious decline set in. Whole areas which had been "burned over" by the New Light fires became spiritually "waste places." [113] In 1758 Reverend Benjamin Throop preaching the annual Election Sermon, cried out in language reminiscent of the fathers who fifty years before had bemoaned the Puritan Decline, "There is an awful Decay of Religion . . . the Fear of God is amazingly cast off this Day." [114] Modern authorities are agreed that the Great Awakening in New England was followed by a period of religious indifference.[115]

Conclusion

It is from this background of religious dissent and enthusiasm in a society in which the desire for social equality had combined in a most remarkable way with the common man's desire for "a religion after his own heart," that one must seek the origins

[112] Larned, op. cit., I, 483; Blake, op. cit., 123 ff.
[113] M. H. Mitchell, op. cit., 17.
[114] Quoted in G. L. Walker, Some Aspects, 112.
[115] Meyer, op. cit., 32; Blake, op. cit., 56; G. L. Walker, op. cit., 112; W. Walker, Congregational Churches, 264–265.

of much that is most characteristic of Protestantism in America. Religious toleration, the separation of church and state, and freedom of conscience have long been recognized as due in no small measure to the courage and stubborness of humble Separates and Baptists. The democracizing of the churches, manifest in the prominent part taken by laymen in both preaching and praying in public, is also a legacy from "the Opinionists." Above all, "the confusion of tongues" presented by the two hundred-and-twelve small sects and denominations in America [116] is largely due to the continuance of "enthusiasm." The revivals which were such a constant feature of frontier religion and which still find echoes in "Old Fashioned Revival Hours" and in the swing-singing of "Gospel" hymns, are manifestations of the same spirit that stirred Windham County two hundred years ago. Transcendentalism and other "liberal" and intellectual reactions to these tendencies in American religion have been as futile as Dr. Chauncy's Seasonable Thoughts. The centrifugal forces of religious enthusiasm and separatism have "Americanized" Christianity.

[116] E. T. Clark, The Small Sects of America (Nashville, 1937).

THE LAYMAN'S COMPLAINT AND THE FRIAR'S ANSWER

THE two poems which I shall here transcribe and discuss have been often noticed but never printed. They appear as additions in a fifteenth century hand to a version of the late fourteenth century treatise Poor Caitiff, preserved in MS. St. John's College, Cambridge, G. 28 (195), itself of the fifteenth century. Besides our two poems, which appear on the front fly-leaves, the margins contain numerous scribbles in one or more sixteenth century hands.[1] The manuscript possesses marks of ownership by one John Graunge, who also owned another fifteenth century collection containing such Latin pieces as Expositio Symboli, Peter of Blois's De Amicitia Christiana, Speculum St. Eadmundi, and Decretum Abbreviatum, now preserved in the same library.[2] The donor of our manuscript was Thomas Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, who gave it to the College in 1635.[3]

One is tempted to assume more than a coincidence in the appearance of these two satires on mendicants in a manuscript of Poor Caitiff. James seems to imply something of the sort when he says that the variable manual of religious instruction which went under this title was traditionally assigned to a friar writing "in suo defensorio."[4] The source of this attribution is a note in MS. Harley 2236 based on the remarks of a certain "Episcopus Cistrensis." Possibly Reginald Pecock is meant, but none of his extant works refers to Poor Caitiff.[5] Nor is there anything in the treatise itself to confirm the assumption that it was written by such a hand or for such a purpose, a fact abundantly shown by the alternative ascription to Wyclif

[1] Montague R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 230–231. I am indebted to the Librarian of St. John's for permission to secure photostats and to edit the poems.

[2] James, pp. 212–213.

[3] James, p. xiii.

[4] Page 231.

[5] Hope Emily Allen, MLR, XVIII (1923), 3–4. The information might have appeared in "þe book of lay mennys bookis," if Pecock ever wrote the Latin work by that name which he mentions in The Follower to the Donet, ed. Elsie V. Hitchcock (London [EETS 164], 1924), p. 7.

or a follower of his.[6] Margaret Deanesly has demonstrated its conventional and non-Wyclifite nature, however;[7] and Hope Emily Allen has further shown its development from such orthodox sources as the Ancren Riwle and various works of Rolle. In all probability there is neither Lollard nor Franciscan bias in the treatise sufficient to make it the springboard for our two poems. But its title and its comment on the virtues of poverty may have had something to do with the mental associations of our scribe or author.

There can be no doubt that the poems were composed by one who sympathized with the new order of things. Two pieces of evidence make it clear that the poet was no mere secular priest at war with his mendicant rivals. For one thing there is unorthodox and savage irony in the second poem. There can be no denying that the supposed friar's statement

> Men schul fynde vn*ne*þe a frer*e*
> In Englonde wiþ*in* a whille

has about it an air of wishful thinking far from the simple desire to reform the Orders of Poverty under secular auspices. A second and more important clue to the poet's fundamental revolt is found not only in his references to the reading of Scripture by the laity, but also by his actual use of the Lollard Bible.[8] The first poem contains the words

> Goddis lawe ȝe reue*r*son,
> And mennes howsis ȝe p*er*sen,
> As Poul beriþ wittnes.

In the Vulgate (II Timothy iii. 1–6) the passage alluded to runs

> Hoc autem scito, quod in nouissimis diebus instabunt tempora periculosa. et erunt homines seipsos amantes, cupidi, elati, superbi, blasphemi. . . . Et hos deuita. *Ex his enim sunt qui penetrant domos:* et *captiuas* ducunt mulierculas oneratas peccatis, quae ducuntur variis desideriis.

The second version of the Lollard Bible reads "men schulen be louynge hemsilf, coueitouse, hiȝ of bering, proude, blasfemeris. . . . And

[6] See Allen, p. 4, and also her Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle Hermit of Hampole (New York, 1927), pp. 406–407. H. G. Pfander, "Some Medieval Manuals of Religious Instruction," JEGP, XXXV (1936), 251, says "it seems to have been a manual popular among the Wyclifites." Poor Caitiff has never been printed in full. James and Miss Allen refer to an edition promised by "Mr. Peake" for the EETS, but the last appearance of this title in the Society's prospectus was in 1917.

[7] The Lollard Bible (Cambridge, 1920), pp. 346–348.

[8] Since the medieval prohibition of the vernacular to laymen has often been questioned, it is convenient here to refer to the evidence set forth by Miss Deanesly, pp. 326–333 and passim.

eschewe thou these men. *Of these thei ben that persen housis*, and leden wymmen *caitifs* chargid with synnes, which ben led with dyuerse desiris." [9] One manuscript of the Lollard translation even glosses the passage with an allusion to religious hypocrisy; in view of the common charge of the friar's familiarity "with worthy wommen of the toun" no Wyclifite could have overlooked the significance of St. Paul's words.

We must therefore conclude that the author of our poems sympathized with or belonged to the reforming party, and that his purpose was similar to that of the fourteenth century author of Pierce the Ploughmans Crede. Several passages in our poems in fact recall the Crede, which our author may well have seen. But most of the charges against the friars common to these three poems are frequently enough encountered elsewhere, and there are no verbal or metrical parallels to suggest direct borrowing from the Crede. Nor are there any striking similarities to the other fourteenth or fifteenth century attacks on friars.[10] In his dramatic conception of Layman's Complaint and Friar's Answer our poet is unique.

It would be pleasing to conjecture that this copy of the two poems is the original, especially in view of the association furnished by the word "caitifs" in the bible passage just quoted. But if there is anything more than mere chance involved in the connection between the Wyclifite Bible, our two poems, and Poor Caitiff, it must have been in another manuscript than the one before us. The errors in the text are too many to be attributed to anything but a careless scribe. Of course the original may itself have been a rough draft. The obscurity in the rime-scheme of the second poem and certain faulty rimes reveal that the author was no paragon. But there are other faults which are in all likelihood scribal. In the first poem we see miscopying, cancellation and correction (line 18); in the second poem two omissions supplied by the scribe (lines 23 and 26) and one unsupplied (line 25), and the failure to copy a contraction (line 32).

[9] Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederic Madden, ed., The Holy Bible . . . Made from the Latin by John Wycliffe and his Followers (Oxford, 1850), IV, 468. The Authorized Version reads "For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts."

[10] For other poems of this sort see Carleton Brown and Rossell H. Robbins, The Index of Middle English Verse (New York, 1943), nos. 808, 871, 1148, 2026, 2663, 2777, 3328; and also Flügel, Anglia, XII (1889–90), 268. On the whole subject see Rudolf Schneider, Der Mönch in der englischen Dichtung (Leipzig [Palaestra 155], 1928), where our two poems are not mentioned.

Our texts have been noticed by Wells [11] and by Carleton Brown,[12] both of whom describe them as one poem in nine six-line stanzas. That there is an intimate relationship between the two is plain, but the fifty-four lines are not all in the same stanza-pattern. The *aabaab* scheme is confined to the three stanzas of what I have called The Layman's Complaint; in The Friar's Answer we have what might be described as nine quatrains in the process of evolving into octets. How much of intention and how much of chance there is in the eight-line patterns is uncertain; but lines 1–8 clearly form the scheme *abababab*, and lines 12 20 seem to have been planned as either *ababcbcb* or *ababcbdb*. These inconsistencies strengthen the feeling that the original was a rough draft rather than a completed poem.

In my transcript I have normalized the capitals, indicated expansions by italics and missing words or letters by square brackets, and supplied all marks of punctuation, including hyphens to connect parts of words separated in the manuscript.

I — THE LAYMAN'S COMPLAINT

[f. ib] Þou þat sellest þe worde of God,
Be þou berfot, be þou schod,
Cum nomore here.
Inprincipio erat verbum
Is þe worde of God, all *and* sum,
Þat þou sellest, lewed frere.

Hit is cursed symonie
Eþer to selle or to bye
Ony gostly þinge;
Þerfore, frere, go as þou come,
And hold þe in þi hows at home
Til we þe almis brynge.

Goddis lawe ȝe reuerson,
And mennes howsis ȝe persen,
As Poul beriþ wittnes.
As mydday deuelis goynge abowte
For money lowle ȝe lowte,
Flatteringe boyþe more *and* lesse.

I. 18 fla-ynge *crossed through and* c. *written above for cancellation;* Flatteringe *inserted with caret.*

[11] First Supplement to A Manual of the Writings in Middle English (New Haven, 1923), pp. 957, 1009.

[12] A Register of Middle English Religious & Didactic Verse (Oxford, 1916–20), I, 231, II, 356 (no. 2387). The revision, Brown and Robbins' Index, correctly describes them as two poems (nos. 3697 and 161).

II — THE FRIAR'S ANSWER

Allas! what schul we freris do,
Now lewed men kun holy writ?

II. 1–2 *In margin in later hand* "*The fryers Compleynt.*"

Alle abowte whire I go
þei aposen me of it.

þen wondriþ me þat it is so,
How lewed men kun alle wite.
Sertenly we be vn-do,
But if we mo amende it.

I trowe þe deuel browt it aboute —
To write þe gospel in Englishe;
Ffor lewed men ben nowe so stowt
þat þei ȝeuen vs neyþer fleche ne fishe.

[f. ii] When I come in-to a schope
Forto say "inprincipio,"
þei bidine me "Goo forþ, lewed Coppe!"
And worche *and* win my siluer so.

Yf Y sa[i]e hit longoþ not
Ffor prestis to worche where þei go,
þei leggen for hem holi writ
And sein þat Seint Polle did soo.

þan þei loken on my nabete
And sein "Forsoþe, with-outton oþes,
Wheþer it be russet, blakk or white,

II. 23 blake *cancelled and* blakk *inserted with caret.*

It is worþe alle ouþer werynge cloþes!"

I saye I [aske] not for me,
Bot for them þat haue none;

II. 26 them *inserted above line with caret.*

þei seyne "þou hauist to or þree;
ȝeuen hem þat nedith þerof oone."

þus oure disseytis bene aspiede
In þis maner *and* mani moo;
Fewe men bedden vs abyde
But heþ[er] fast þat we were goo.

If it goo forþe in þis maner
It wole done vs myche gyle;
Men schul fynde vnneþe a frere
In Englonde wiþin a whille.

NOTES

I. 2 *berfot.* On the controversy over whether friars should wear shoes sandals or no footwear at all see A. G. Little, Studies in English Franciscan History (Manchester, 1917), pp. 56–57. Compare lines 298–300 of Pierce the Ploughmans Crede, ed. W. W. Skeat (London [EETS 30], 1867), pp. 11–12:

> "Fraunces bad his breþeren · barfote to wenden;
> Nou han þei bucled schon · for bleynynge of her heles,
> And hosen in harde weder · y-hamled by þe ancle."

I. 4 *Inprincipio.* The two words are consistently joined in the MS. Possibly the poet intended to convey that they were uttered as jargon. These words from the beginning of the Gospel of John were the conventional greeting of friars. According to F. N. Robinson, The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, Cambridge, 1933, p. 758, the passage was "regarded with peculiar reverence and even held to have a magical virtue." To his extensive list of references we may add J. S. P. Tatlock, "Chaucer and Wyclif," MPh XIV (1916–17), 268. Our poet seems to imply that the "lewed frere" is ignorant of the Scriptural origin of the phrase.

I. 14–15 *mennes howsis ȝe persen.* II Timothy iii. 1–6. See introduction.

I. 16 *mydday deuelis.* One is reminded of the religious *incubi* in Chaucer's Wife of Bath's Tale III. 857–81. Professor La Piana has kindly called my attention to the liturgical "a demonio meridiano libera nos Domine." No doubt Chaucer and our poet refer to a current jest identifying the demon of the litany with the friars.

II. 4 *aposen.* This is a regular variant of *oppose* in its common scholastic sense "to argue against, bring forward objections or difficulties to be answered." See NED, *appose v.*[1]

II. 15 *Coppe.* The rime with *schoppe* is unusual, but the quantity and quality of the vowel in this derivative of Lat. *cāpa* (OE* *cápa*) or of ON *kápa* are variable (compare the related words *cap* and *cape*). NED, *cope sb.*[1] records the spelling *coppe* from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. The NED lists no cases of the transfer to the person wearing the garment.

II. 17 *not.* The rime *not: writ* suggests emendation either to *nowit* (*náwiht* with loss of spirant and no compensatory lengthening) or to *lit* "little" (noun as adverb, see NED, *lite sb.*[4]). But other crudities in the text suggest a careless poet.

II. 17–20. On St. Paul's combination of missionary work with tentmaking see Acts xviii. 3, and Carleton Brown, ed., The Pardoner's Tale (Oxford, 1935), pp. 30–31.

II. 21 *my nabete.* The NED does not list this particular example of false division under *N3.*

II. 23 *russet, blakk or white.* The same colors are used in connection with friars in Pierce the Ploughmans Crede, pp. 26–27; see also pp. 33–34, 53. In The Court of Love, ed. W. W. Skeat, The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer (Oxford, 1894–97), VII, 416, the colors are white, russet and green. Green is of course the color of inconstancy, but the other three colors were actually worn. The Carmelites' habit was white and the Dominicans' black. Any hermit or professional poor man might wear the coarse grayish-red

oolen cloth known as russet. It was the habit of Piers Plowman (The Vision f William Concerning Piers the Plowman, ed. W. W. Skeat [Oxford, 1924], , 2–3, 252–53, II, 2, 132). Our author is most likely alluding to its use as he decreed material for the Franciscan tunic (see Little, pp. 59–61).

II. 25. Our poet consistently has four beats to the line in The Friar's nswer. Since this line lacks a beat, and the sense is unclear, I have sup- lied the word *aske*, though any word like *begge* or *bidde* would do as well.

II. 27. Compare Pierce the Ploughmans Crede, p. 9. After a description f the royal halls built by the friars the Crede continues:

> "And zet þise bilderes wilne beggen · a bagg-ful of wheate
> Of a pure pore man · þat maie oneþe paie
> Halfe his rente in a ȝer · and half ben behynde."

II. 32. The MS *heþ* has probably been copied from an original *heþer* with he *er* curl ignored. Some may prefer to read *hey* "hie, hasten" or even 'high"; but our scribe is consistent in preserving the distinction between and *y* by dotting his *y's*, and there is no dot over the last letter in this word.

Francis Lee Utley

The Ohio State University

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE BAHÁ' Í CENTENARY, 1844–1944. . . . *Compiled by The National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahá'ís of the United States and Canada.* Wilmette, Illinois, Bahá'í Publishing Committee, 1944. xx, 253 p. [n.p.]

THE CHURCH IN LATVIA. *By Alfred Bilmanis.* New York, Drauga-Vesta, 1945. 35 p. [n.p.]

HOW TO THINK OF CHRIST. *By William Adams Brown.* New York, Scribner, 1945. xxii, 305 p. $3.00.

LATVIAN-RUSSIAN RELATIONS: DOCUMENTS. *Compiled by Alfred Bilmanis.* Washington, D.C., The Latvian Legation, 1944. 255 p. [n.p.]

NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP IN MY TIME. *By Sir Robert Falconer.* Reprinted from the University of Toronto Quarterly, Vol. XIV, No. 2, January, 1945. pp. 135–149. [n.p.]

PASTORAL CARE OF NERVOUS PEOPLE: AN ELEMENTARY HANDBOOK. *By Henry Jerome Simpson.* New York, Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1945. xi, 194 p. $2.25.

PRAYER AND THE SERVICE OF GOD. *By Daniel T. Jenkins.* New York, Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1945. vii, 135 p. $1.50.

Conservation of Scholarly Journals

The American Library Association created this last year the Committee on Aid to Libraries in War Areas, headed by John R. Russell, the Librarian of the University of Rochester. The Committee is faced with numerous serious problems and hopes that American scholars and scientists will be of considerable aid in the solution of one of these problems.

One of the most difficult tasks in library reconstruction after the first World War was that of completing foreign institutional sets of American scholarly, scientific, and technical periodicals. The attempt to avoid a duplication of that situation is now the concern of the Committee.

Many sets of journals will be broken by the financial inability of the institutions to renew subscriptions. As far as possible they will be completed from a stock of periodicals being purchased by the Committee. Many more will have been broken through mail difficulties and loss of shipments, while still other sets will have disappeared in the destruction of libraries. The size of the eventual demand is impossible to estimate, but requests received by the Committee already give evidence that it will be enormous.

With an imminent paper shortage attempts are being made to collect old periodicals for pulp. Fearing this possible reduction in the already limited supply of scholarly and scientific journals, the Committee hopes to enlist the coöperation of subscribers to this journal in preventing the sacrifice of this type of material to the pulp demand. It is scarcely necessary to mention the appreciation of foreign institutions and scholars for this activity.

Questions concerning the project or concerning the value of particular periodicals to the project should be directed to Wayne M. Hartwell, Executive Assistant to the Committee on Aid to Libraries in War Areas, Rush Rhees Library, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York.

PRINTED BY THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRINTING OFFICE
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U.S.A.